

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
JANUARY, 1897.

ARTICLE I.

COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

BY PROFESSOR LUTHER A. FOX, D. D.

The communion of saints is an article in the Apostles' Creed. It is not proposed to discuss its meaning in the Creed, but the acquaintance of the dead with the current events of the world.

As memory and affection survive death, the dead do not lose their interest in the world. The lost, as is shown in the case of the rich man, do not cease to love their families and friends who are yet on earth. Much less do the saints who are in the realm of love, and whose natures are expanded to higher and truer love, cease to love the surviving families and friends. They form new and very congenial associations. Their love for God is greatly increased. They are deeply interested in the wonderful facts of their new home. But if the damned, whose affections are dwarfed, and whose natures are soured, are not so absorbed by their agonies, neither will the saved be so occupied with their happiness as to forget the ties of earth.

The Christian on earth loves God supremely, but he loves also his family. Supreme love for God enlarges our hearts and intensifies our natural affections. We have evidence of our love

VOL. XXVII. No. 1.

I

to God in the fact that we love more our fellowmen. "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren." Separation and new association here on earth gradually weaken our affections, until at length we feel only a slight interest in those whom we once tenderly loved, but under the new conditions of the spirit world this limitation may be removed, and years may make no change.

The saints retain a profound interest in the world. The interest felt here is deepened there by their new relations. They love Christ more. They understand better the mission of the Church. They realize more fully the close connection between the state of the Church and the glory of its Head. They become, therefore, more profoundly concerned in its progress. Their own advancement may be conditioned upon its success. This deeper interest in the Church increases their interest in their friends. The saints may care much less about the health and temporal success, but much more about the growth in grace, and the activity in religious work of their loved ones yet in the flesh.

This interest will make the saints anxious to know what is taking place in the world. If there is any legitimate means of obtaining information, they will avail themselves of it. If they know nothing of us and of the Church since they left us, it is solely because they cannot.

There are several possible and probable means by which they may keep up an acquaintance with the world.

They may learn much from those who are entering heaven. The dying carry with them into the other world all the information in their possession of the state of their friends and of the world. There is no conceivable reason why they should not communicate this information to those who preceded them. It seems perfectly natural that they should desire to tell all they know to those willing to hear. The saints are eager to learn. The only room for doubt is in regard to the meeting of these friends. It may seem improbable that, amid the immense throng, those just dead should meet those who had preceded them from the same community. But this improbability is largely removed by facts which shall hereafter appear. As we send messages to

distant friends by those passing from us to them, there is nothing improper in sending messages by the dying to our friends in heaven. They will certainly inquire about us, and we may give them assurances of our continued hope and faith and love for them.

The saints may learn of the world and of their friends from the angels. The angels are ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation. They rejoice over every sinner that repenteth. They are intimately acquainted with the minute affairs of the Church. They are studying with intense zeal the mysteries of redemption. The heavens are opened and they are continually ascending and descending on their missions of love. The saints doubtless inquire of them concerning their friends who are still in the world.

The saints are probably immediate personal observers. The proof is not positive, but affords a strong degree of probability.

Immediate personal observation is not in itself impossible. They are pure spirits, and while they are not omnipotent, they have a celerity that transcends our comprehension. They may be called ubiquitous. Christ said they are like the angels, or equal to the angels. The angels are not bound by the laws of the material world, and have relations to space different from those of physical bodies. They pass from earth to heaven and from heaven to earth with a rapidity greater than that of light, and one that defies our powers of conception. Daniel said: "I set my face unto the Lord to seek by prayer and supplication, with fasting, sackcloth and ashes. While I was speaking and praying and confessing my sins, yea while I was speaking even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly touched me about the time of the evening oblation." Dr. Timothy Dwight remarks upon this passage that "it is a rapidity exceeding the comprehension of the most active imagination, surpassing beyond any comparison the amazing swiftness of light." The saints may, therefore, like the angels pass frequently from their home in heaven to the world and keep themselves as intimately acquainted with the affairs of the world as the angels themselves. If they do not, it is be-

cause of some confinement or special limitations of which we have no intimation.

Foregleams of this power are given us in extraordinary dreams and in cases of special sight. It was customary for a long time to set aside all such things as superstitious and false, but facts have accumulated to such an extent as to forbid a summary dismissal. James Freeman Clark says: "There are the well attested facts concerning the transfer of the senses: that people under the influence of animal magnetism can read with their foreheads, the pit of their stomachs, or the back of their heads. We have seen a boy when magnetized lift a chair with three heavy men standing on it. Clairvoyance, or seeing at a distance, though not so well proved, is confirmed by a vast number of facts. Preternatural knowledge in such cases as narrated by Dr. Bushnell of Yount in California; or knowledge through dreams, waking presentiments; cases of foresight or prophecy; of insight or knowledge of what is passing in other minds; of clairvoyance, or what is happening at a distance, of which multitudes of facts are recorded in such books as the *Seeress of Provost*, *Mrs. Crowe's Night Side of Nature*, *Robert Dale Owen's Footfalls from the Boundary of the Unseen World*, which after being sifted by a fine criticism will have a large residuum of irresolvable facts." (*Orthodoxy*, p. 78).

We have such cases in various periods and countries. It is said of Ambrose of Milan that while celebrating mass in his own city, he fell into a trance and witnessed the funeral of St. Martin in Tours. Kant tells of the case of Swedenborg who while in Gottenburg described a fire at that moment raging in Stockholm. Dr. Wayland, in an appendix to his *Intellectual Philosophy*, records the case of a sailor who frequently told of things which were taking place at great distance from himself.

Rev. J. P. Smeltzer, D. D., President of Newberry College, S. C., related this fact. One afternoon he lay down to take a short sleep. He saw a young woman in great suffering, and persons trying to secure relief for her. He felt that he was in a strange state, neither awake nor yet asleep. He was aroused and stated his experience to the minister whom he was assisting in special

services. A few hours later he was summoned home to find that the suffering woman was his own wife, and that the scene he had witnessed had occurred in his own family. He made this statement to the present writer.

A young woman, near Timberville, Va., the subject of cataleptic states, had some quite remarkable experiences. On one occasion she said her soldier brother was sitting on a log writing a letter. The letter came verifying the statement. On another occasion, when recovering from one of these states, she said that a great battle had just been fought and that her brother had been killed. Her statements were in a few days confirmed. These facts were furnished by a minister who was a perfectly competent and reliable witness.

Three members of the Society for Psychical Research in England, Messrs. E. Gurney, M. A., of Cambridge, F. W. H. Myers, M. A., of Cambridge, and F. Podmore, M. A., have given us *Phantasms of the Living* in two large octavo volumes, the materials for which had been reported to the society and ordered published. In these volumes we have a great many cases collated with scientific care. The main theses of the book are stated thus: "I. Experiment proves that telepathy—the supersensory transference of thought and feeling from one mind to another—is a fact in Nature. II. Testimony proves that phantasms, (impressions, voices or figures) of persons undergoing some crisis—especially death—are perceived by their friends and relatives with a frequency which mere chance cannot explain. III. These phantasms then, whatever else they may be, are instances of the supersensory action of one mind on another. Such are the theses of this work,—theses on which its authors and the friends whom they have mainly consulted are in entire agreement."

These gentlemen have not thoroughly succeeded in establishing beyond question their theses, but they have done much toward showing their high probability. They have given some philosophic support to the opinion entertained by such eminent men as Bacon and Goethe, and commenced the answer to the question asked by Tennyson,—

"Star to star vibrates light, may soul to soul
Strike thro' some finer element of her own?"

The conclusion we would draw is only hypothetical. If it be true that minds encumbered with bodies, and habituated to the use of the senses can in extraordinary cases know objects and events in a manner above the reach of the senses, then can pure spirits observe at much greater distances. The facts make it probable that the saints can know what is occurring upon the earth. But it must be admitted that scientific observation has not and cannot furnish any direct evidence of the fact that the dead are observers of the events upon earth.

The Scriptures encourage, at least, the belief that the saints are acquainted with the affairs of the Church in this world.

In the account of the transfiguration we have the fact that on extraordinary occasions the saints know what is taking place among men, and that they may revisit the earth. Elijah and Moses came and ministered to Jesus. They talked with him about his death which was then pending. In this case they show an intimate acquaintance with the affairs of the world. It may have been by special inspiration, or it may have been that a special privilege was granted to these two for the mission. But the stronger probability is that they enjoyed only a common benefit. We have this truth beyond question, that under some circumstances the saints may be witnesses of things on the earth.

In the Old Testament we have the account of the appearance of Samuel at the call of the witch of Endor. Samuel told Saul of his death the next day on Gilboa. Samuel knew what had occurred, where the armies were encamped, and what would be the result of the impending battle. True, he had been a prophet and may have retained his prophetic powers after his death, but we have left the fact that some of the saints know the actions and conditions of men. This story and its lessons have been questioned by some modern critics. We have not sufficient evidence of its spuriousness to cause us to reject it. So far as appears, it was a part of the original record, and comes to us with the authority of inspiration. We must accept it, or read out of these ancient

books everything that is extraordinary. If we reject one statement, because it does not accord with our ideas of the probable, where shall we stop short of a rejection of the very idea of revelation.

In the Book of Revelation there is mention of two occasions (chap. 19 : 9, 10, and 22 : 8, 9,) where John saw an angel and fell down to worship him. Both angels forbade it, the one saying : "See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant and of them that have the testimony of Jesus;" the other : "See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant, and one of thy brethren the prophets." One of the old prophets was sent back under the garb of an angel to reveal to John, his fellow servant, the things to come. The ordinary interpretation finds, however, simply an angel. If he had wished to characterize himself only as an angel, it was not necessary for him to add "of thy brethren the prophets." Is it true that a mere angel is one of the prophets?

In the Epistle to the Hebrews we have this language : "Wherefore seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us run with patience the race set before us." This follows the eleventh chapter in which a number of examples of faith are enumerated and which closes with the words : "And what shall I more say ? for the time would fail me to tell of Gideon and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephtha, of David also, and of the prophets ; who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of aliens, women received their dead raised to life again, and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection ; and others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonments ; they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword ; they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented, (of whom the world was not worth) ; they wandered in deserts, in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth. And these all having obtained a good re-

port through faith received not the promise, God having provided some better things for us, that they without us should not be made perfect. Wherefore, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses," &c. There has not been nor can be a question as to the fact that the cloud of witnesses is in some way connected with the sainted dead, but there is a difference of opinion as to the manner of witnessing. Perhaps a majority of the Protestants who have ventured on an opinion, have regarded the language as highly figurative. They hold that the writer of the Epistle personifies the examples and sets them up as witnesses. This interpretation robs the exhortation of its chief force. A mere abstraction is very little stimulus to endeavor. The supposed fervid imagination of that writer cannot be sustained by other Christians under the severe physical trials of stonings and imprisonments. It is not a sudden spurt of effort, but a life-long race to which he is pointing. The examples of others are not usually thought of as witnesses, though they may give encouragement. This interpretation so weakens the words of the apostle and is so unsatisfactory that many others who are unwilling to accept the literal meaning, have avoided any explanation whatever. The literal interpretation of the Scriptures, when no special nor cogent reason for the figurative exists, is always to be preferred.

The writer in grouping the suffering saints of other ages has been moved, but has not been so impassioned as to jump from facts to the bold imagery the ordinary interpretation requires. For these reasons some Protestants have adhered to the natural meaning. Fausset says: "The witnesses answer to the spectators pressing around the arena to see the competitors for the prize. Those witnessed of become intense witnesses in a two-fold way: (1) Attesting by their own case the faithfulness of God to his people; (2) witnessing our struggle of faith. This second sense, though agreeing with the image, is not positively and directly sustained by Scripture." The commentator sees the truth but he does not venture to break away absolutely from the old interpretations. Dr. A. P. Peabody does not hesitate to speak out his whole opinion. "This idea of the presence of the

departed and their surviving interest in the scenes among which their trophies were won, is a familiar one with the sacred writers, though nowhere else exhibited with the scenic effect with which it is here placed before the imagination. What a glorious and inspiring thought that we are acting our parts, fulfilling our mission beneath the loving and solicitous regards of the great and good as their ranks have multiplied all down through the Christian ages.*

Whether from the Bible or apostolic tradition, or from some other source, the belief that the saints are frequently with us made its appearance at a very early period in the Church. Origen held that "the souls of good men after the death of the body are turned into angels and fly about the world, helping and defending men from mishaps."† It had become universal long before the alienation between the Greek and Roman Churches. Upon it was based the custom, which was universal all down through the Middle Ages, of the invocation of the saints. Those who opposed that service, as Lactantius and Athanasius, based their objection not on the fact that the saints could not be present, but upon the principle that God is the sole object of prayer. The Greek and Roman Churches still hold to the invocation of the saints, and thus believe without question that the saints are intimately acquainted with us.

Many eminent Protestants, while rejecting the invocation of the saints, agree with the Roman and Greek Churches in the belief that the dead are in close fellowship and intimate association with men on the earth.

Dr. Nevin defends it upon the ground of its catholicity. "It is moreover a strictly catholic idea, the sense of which has been actively present in the mind of the Church through all ages in her doctrine of the communion of saints. This regards not merely Christians on earth but also the sainted dead according to the true sense of the hymn,

"The saints on earth and all the dead
But one communion make."

*Christian Consolation.

†Chemnitz's Examen.

But communion implies a continuity of reciprocal knowledge and affection. If death sundered absolutely the new consciousness of the believer from the old, there could be no real conjunction of this sort between the living and the departed members of Christ's body. There is a dangerous tendency in the religious world at the present time towards a false view of this relation, by which in fact the dead are taken to be so dissociated from the living as to have no further part in the onward movement of Christ's kingdom. But this is an error fully as bad, to say the least, as the old superstition of invoking the saints and praying for the dead."*

Dr. Samuel Hopkins maintains it upon the ground of the increased powers and advantages of the saints. "They do not go into some dark corner of the universe, out of sight of heaven, of Christ, of his Church and of the world; but when they leave the body they rise into light and take a station in which they are under advantages to see all those things, and all worlds, being all attention to them, and having a perfect discerning without the least cloud or darkness, seeing and enjoying the glory of the Redeemer, and the prosperity and success of the work of redemption among men. And their happiness must increase as the cause of Christ advances on earth and as the kingdom of Satan sinks and is destroyed."†

Dr. Mulford puts it upon the same ground. "They who have gone have not, therefore, passed into a condition of lethargy and vacancy. They may be nearer to us as they are nearer to perfect love. They may guide us towards a holier and ampler freedom since they suffer no more the limitations of time. The veil is rent. There is with us the presence of the unseen host. It is not alone their memory that remains: their spirits may be with us. This brings us the chastity of hope. It becomes the incentive to effort—seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses let us lay aside every weight."‡

Dr. R. B. Storrs finds a reason in their continued interest in the world. "It is not unnatural to feel that they, who by wis-

*Mystical Presence.

†Works.

‡Republic of God.

dom, by valor, by sacrifice have contributed to maintain and perfect the institutions which we possess, have also an interest in this day. To a spirit alive with memories of the time, and rejoicing in the presage of noble futures, recalling the great, the beloved, the heroic who have labored and joyfully died for its coming, it will not seem too fond an enthusiasm to feel the air quick with shapes we cannot see, and glorious with faces whose light serene we cannot catch."*

Dr. F. W. Krummacher tells, with a defence, of the habit of Oberlin in which that great missionary and saint manifested his firm belief in the continued association with the dead. "By a sudden stroke he lost what was called by him his dearest treasure on earth. His faithful companion and untiring helper in every enterprise was taken away. He could not be comforted. He was unspeakably desolate. She was the repository of his most secret thoughts and plans. To her he spoke with confidence of everything that occupied or affected him. Her ever wise counsel he was accustomed faithfully to follow. Whither could he turn or where stand, now that she was gone? And what have we in his diary which has been preserved to us? Nothing less than that he lived through nine years in communion with the glorified one—now in dream, now in vision when he was awake—and that he continued to discuss with her every measure which he purposed. What he records of this is as it were a real occurrence. It were well before we dismiss this with the exclamation, "Phantasy!" "Delusion!" "Hallucination!" to withhold our judgment over such a mysterious fact until it please God to show us more concerning the relations of the worlds visible and invisible than he has yet vouchsafed to tell."†

The Protestant Reformers found the invocation of the saints among the errors and abuses of the Romish Church. They saw that it was based upon the belief in the continued presence of the saints with the Church on earth. They found what seemed to them no clear scripture proofs for the opinion, and in their zeal to correct the abuses, assailed the foundation. They dog-

*Oration, July 1876. Quoted from Mulford.

†Lives of the Leaders of the Church Universal.

matically denied where only suspended faith was warranted. There is no necessary connection between the opinion and the practice of praying to the dead. We may hold the one without falling into the other.

The proof is strong but not irresistible. There is room for doubt. Only a strong degree of probability can be claimed for the belief. Neither reason nor Scripture forbid it. Both encourage it. We may, with a large majority of the Church, including many eminent Protestant theologians, hold it and draw comfort from it without being justly exposed to the charge of superstition or opposition to the Scriptures.

ARTICLE II.

PHILIP MELANCHTHON.

BY REV. WILLIAM KELLY.

The events of the sixteenth century will always claim the attention and command the interest of the Christian world. The stirring incidents it commemorates, and the forces then set in motion, cause it to rank in importance only second to the first century of the Christian era. It marks the turn of tide in the stream of history; it stands as the point of a new departure in the annals of time;—the period of cleavage between two great epochs. On one side of the dividing line are the forces and ages of moral, spiritual, civil and intellectual darkness, civil and ecclesiastical despotism; on the other are ranged the forces and centuries of moral, spiritual, civil and intellectual light, civil and religious liberty. The century itself, transitional in its events, marks the point of departure from one period, and advancement toward the other. Side by side with the stirring incidents of this era, are the names and achievements of certain individuals, who were largely instrumental in shaping the course of its events. Two names especially loom prominently into view, as two lofty mountain peaks lift themselves above the surrounding hills, the names of Martin Luther and Philip Melanchthon. The latter is the subject of this article.

Philip Schwartzerd, changed to Philip Melanchthon, was born on the sixteenth of February, 1497, in the village of Bretten, and Duchy of Baden. His mother, Barbara Reuter Schwartzerd, was of a good family; his father, George Schwartzerd, a cultured and scholarly gentleman, was in the military employ of the Palatine princes, holding the position of armorer. From his earliest years, the son of the armorer displayed a precocious intellect, thirsting for knowledge, and naturally studious. He easily distanced his young competitors in the race of intellect; and so rapid was his mental development that at the early age of ten, we find him attending the Latin School of Pfortzheim, where he studied two years under the tutelage of John Hungarius. Having lost his father when but eleven years of age, John Reuchlin, his uncle, one of the most scholarly men of the period, directed his studies, which were so successfully prosecuted at the university of Heidelberg, where he matriculated in 1509, that one year later he composed a Latin comedy, and at fourteen years of age attained the degree of Bachelor of Arts. The custom of adopting Greek surnames being in vogue among the learned, the name Melanchthon, equivalent to Schwartzerd, signifying black earth, was conferred on Philip by Reuchlin. The Master's degree being refused him at Heidelberg, in spite of his attainments, because he was deemed too young to receive that honor, Melanchthon entered the University of Tübingen at fifteen years of age where, two years later, in 1514, he obtained the coveted degree of Master of Arts; and at nineteen years of age was made a Doctor of Philosophy.

At Tübingen he became interested in the subject of theology, a study that possessed for him a peculiar fascination, and in which he attained such marked proficiency that one of his titles is, The Theologian of the Reformation. Dr. Fisher, declares that "next to Luther, Melanchthon was the leading expounder of doctrine on the Lutheran side of the controversy;" a judgment in which all acquainted with his life and familiar with the events of the Reformation history will unanimously concur. While at Tübingen Melanchthon again entered the realm of authorship, giving to the world an edition of Terence and a grammar of the Greek

language. Refusing calls to professorial chairs in the universities of Ingolstadt and Leipsic, Melanchthon, in 1518, at the age of twenty-one, became Professor of Greek at Wittenberg, entering on the duties of his office in August of that year. Here he formed the acquaintance of Luther, who was Professor of Theology in the same University. The intimacy of these eminent men speedily ripened into mutual esteem, and resulted in a life-long friendship. Each seemed necessary to the other; and the devout and thoughtful student of history will discern a special providence in the bringing together of these kindred souls. Dr. Sprecher writes: "A wonderful interposition of a higher hand is to be seen in the friendship formed between the man of the enthusiastic Propheteia, with the man of Didaskalia—the miner's son, who brought the metal of faith out of the deep shaft, and the armorer's son, who fashioned it into weapons of defence and offence." Merle D'Aubigne exclaims: "We cannot too much admire the goodness and wisdom of God, in bringing together men so different, and yet so necessary to each other. Luther possessed warmth, vigor and strength; Melanchthon, clearness, discretion and mildness. Luther gave energy to Melanchthon, Melanchthon moderated Luther. They were like substances in a state of positive and negative electricity, which mutually act upon each other."

Besides filling the chair of Greek Melanchthon taught the Latin classics and rhetoric in the University. The impression created by the young professor on his first appearance at Wittenberg, was far from flattering; his slight frame, small stature, extreme youth and diffident manner, caused a feeling of disappointment among professors and students. Even Luther is reported to have judged unfavorably of the new member of the Faculty; and the question was generally asked, "Is this the great doctor commended so highly by Reuchlin and Erasmus?" But when, a few days later, the new professor delivered his inaugural, *De corrigendis adolescentiæ studiis*, the first unfavorable impression gave place to sentiments of admiration. The clearness, depth, originality and finish of the Latin oration took the

University by storm, and, like the Trojans listening to the eloquence of Ulysses,

"Wond'ring they heard, and fixed in deep surprise,
Their ears refute the censure of their eyes."

Luther especially was impressed with the scholarly attainments and ability of the young man. Writing to Spalatin he says: "Melanchthon delivered so learned and beautiful a discourse that all listened with astonishment and admiration; we praise and admire his eloquence. I ask for no other Greek master." The impression made on this occasion continued to gain strength. Students from all parts of Europe, to the number of nearly two thousand, attracted by the fame of the young professor, crowded to Wittenberg to attend the lectures on Terence and Vergil, on Titus and Homer; while, like Solomon, Melanchthon, to use his own expression, "sought to bring from the Greek bard Tyrian brass and purple, for the adornment of God's house," Herbrand tells us that not only barons and counts but even princes were to be found in the throng of students." Fisher informs us that "not only Germans and Swiss, but even Italians" studied at Wittenberg. And Luther writes: "His lecture room is always full. All the theologians go to hear him. He is making every class, upper, middle, lower, begin to learn Greek.

About this time in 1520, Melanchthon was happily joined in wedlock to Catharine Krapp, a young woman belonging to one of the best families of Wittenberg. But, however interesting may be Melanchthon's life viewed in connection with his profession, the principal interest in his career arises from the fact that, next to Luther, he was the chief human agent in the work of the great Reformation.

To the part taken by him in this work we now turn. Almost from the beginning of their acquaintanceship, Luther and Melanchthon were mutually attracted—the stronger nature at first by scholastic admiration, the weaker by a feeling of respect and love. Luther was the Peter, but with more courage and steadiness than that apostle; Melanchthon was the John of love and Paul of learning of the Reformation epoch. Melanchthon was led by Luther to a deeper study of the Scriptures; he also em-

braced Luther's opinions on the necessity of ecclesiastical reform. His first appearance in connection with the Reformation, was at the discussion of Leipsic in 1519, between Eckius of Ingoldstadt, the champion of the papacy, and Bodenstein and Luther. While attending this discussion ostensibly as a spectator, Melanchthon nevertheless assisted Carlstadt by pertinent suggestions, till the irritated Eck cried, "Be silent, Philip, mind your own studies, and do not disturb me." Not long after the French Sorbonne declared Luther a heretic, Melanchthon stepped forward in defence of his friend, in his reply to the French theologians clearly proving that Luther, standing with Paul and the apostles on the foundation of God's truth, was a genuine professor of Christian doctrine, and that the real heretics were those who, denying the sufficiency of the word of inspiration, sought to establish their contention by constant appeals to the fathers and councils of the Church.

From this time on we find him almost incessantly standing with Luther in the very thick of the controversial conflict waged with the power of Rome, consecrating himself wholly to the task God had assigned him as a champion of the truth. At the Diet of Spires, and Conference of Marburg in 1529; at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530; at Smalkald in 1537; at Hagenau in 1540, at Worms and Ratisbon in 1541; and again at Worms later, Melanchthon stood by the side of Luther contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. In each separate contest he proved himself a valiant champion of the cause of reform. His logical ability, self-control, command of language, skill in debate, familiarity with the subjects under discussion, retentive memory, and intimate knowledge of the Scriptures rendered him a formidable adversary, few cared to encounter, and none could overthrow. In all questions of importance his opinion was sought, his judgment generally approved, and his decisions adopted by his associates. So general and favorable was the opinion entertained of his ability and judgment that several of the chief rulers of Europe appealed to him for advice in the solution of state, educational and religious problems. Francis the First, with the doctors of the Sorbonne, in 1535, invited him to

France. Henry the Eighth and Cranmer appealed to him to visit England, to assist the English theologians in preparing the Creed of the English Church. Herman, Archbishop of Cologne, in 1539, invoked his aid in the reformation of his diocese, and again four years later requested him to draw up a form of doctrine and worship for the Church of Cologne. In 1556 Maximilian, king of Bohemia, wrote to Melanchthon for a solution of the questions in dispute between the Reformers and the Papacy. While at the Diet of Worms, in 1557, he was appointed as one of the commissioners to represent the Protestant party.

But great as were the services rendered by Melanchthon to the cause of reform by his participation in the debates at the various conventions, it was chiefly by his writings that he achieved his highest fame, exercised the widest influence, acquired the esteem of contemporaries, aided most signally in the reform of the Church, overthrew the sophistries of the Roman advocates, gave to the Church in the Augsburg Confession a sound doctrinal basis, established only on the imperishable foundation of the word of God—a system which has already stood the test of four centuries of criticism, and will continue to endure to the end of time. As an author Melanchthon stands almost preëminent above the writers of his day, prolific as was that era in men of genius. Even the erudite and polished Erasmus yields to him in this particular. An accomplished master of Latin and Greek, as well as German, he not only merited by his writings the lofty title of Preceptor Germaniæ, but earned the far greater honor of being styled "The Pen of the Reformation." In his first address to the Sorbonne in defence of Luther he shows the vigor of a powerful and philosophical mind and the brilliancy of a polished rhetorician. From 1522 to 1534 he assisted in the translation of the Bible, collating the Greek and revising the work of Luther. It was the same great author, who in 1521 prepared the first treatise of Systematic Evangelical Theology, not based on the works of the schoolmen, but from the biblical standpoint, the *Loci Communes*, a work concerning which Luther writes: "The student of theology now

has greater advantages than ever before. First, he has the Bible, which I have translated from Hebrew into German; next he has Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*. Once master of these two volumes, he may be considered a theologian neither devil nor heretic can overcome; all the Fathers combined are not to be compared to Melanchthon's book." Calvin, who published in Geneva an edition of this work, says: "It is a summary of those truths which are essential to the Christian's guidance in the way of salvation.

In the year 1528 he also drew up a series of rules, doctrine and discipline for the Saxon church. In addition to the works referred to, Melanchthon is the author of several commentaries of great merit for the time in which they were written, a number of ethical, philosophical and controversial works, and the *Confessio Saxonica*, a statement of the Protestant faith drawn up for presentation to the Council of Trent.

But the works by which he is most favorably known and on which are based his fame as a theologian, are the Augsburg Confession and the Apology to that Confession. The Augsburg Confession, not only the acknowledged doctrinal standard of the Lutheran Church, but the source from which many confessions of Protestantism have largely drawn their inspiration, was written in 1530, in the city in Bavaria, from which it takes its name, a diet having been convened in Augsburg to arrange for enforcing the decrees of the Diet of Worms and to bring the Church of Germany into allegiance with Rome. The Protestant powers prepared for the struggle by drawing up a confession of faith to present to the Emperor and Diet. The task of preparing this confession was assigned to Melanchthon. D'Aubigne gives the following graphic description of the preparation of that document: "One man of small stature, frail, timid, and in great alarm, was commissioned to prepare this instrument of war. Philip Melanchthon worked at it night and day; he weighed every expression, softened it down, changed it, and then frequently returned to his first idea. He was wasting away, his friends trembled lest he should die over his task, and Luther enjoined him as early as the 12th of May to care for his body.

Notwithstanding these solicitations Melancthon's application increased. At Coburg he had already put his hand to the task, tracing out in the first part the doctrines of the faith according to the Articles of Schwabach; and, in the second, the abuses of the Church, according to the Torgau Articles. At Augsburg he gave a new and more elegant form to this Confession. The Augsburg Confession was completed on the 11th of May, sent to Luther for revision, and returned by Luther with the statement, "I have read Master Philip's Apology [the name first given it]. I like it well enough, and have no corrections to make." The Confession was presented to the Diet on the 25th of June, a day of which D'Aubigne says: "This was destined to be the greatest day of the Reformation, one of the most glorious in the history of Christianity and mankind." The Papists having prepared a so-called confutation, Melancthon wrote, in reply, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, an admirable paper, worthy the piety, learning and reputation of its author.

In these masterly productions of the great theologian, his genius shines forth with fullest blaze. The learned Bossuet, Roman Catholic bishop of Meaux, says: "The Augsburg Confession is the most considerable of all, in every respect. Besides that it was first presented and subscribed by a greater body, it has also this advantage, that it was considered by Bucer, and by Calvin himself, as a work common to the Reformation." D'Aubigne exclaims, "This Confession of Augsburg will ever remain, one of the masterpieces of the human mind enlightened by the Spirit of God." Kurtz writes: "This compact, lucid document, as decided as it was mild, received the full approval of Luther. It made a favorable impression on the assembled princes; whilst the evangelical confessors felt themselves greatly strengthened by the confession of their faith before the emperor and nation." Archbishop Lawrence, of the Church of England, speaks of "that boast of Germany and pride of the Reformation, the Augsburg Confession." Dr. John G. Morris characterized the Augsburg Confession as the "doctrinal Magna Charta of all Protestantdom." The following incident shows the impression produced by the first presentation of this memorable document: "When

the Chancellor of Saxony had finished its reading, the Duke of Bavaria asked Eck whether that doctrine could be overthrown out of the Holy Scriptures? "No!" was the reply of Eck, "we cannot overthrow it by the Scriptures, but we may by appeal to the Fathers." On hearing this reply, the Duke exclaimed: "See how finely our divines support us; the Protestants prove their contention by Scripture; we have our doctrine without the Scripture."

Valuable however as were the services of Melanchthon in the Reformation of the Church, he was not a Luther and could never have performed the work accomplished by his greater coadjutor. No one appreciated this fact better than Melanchthon himself. With all his admirable qualities he was somewhat deficient in firmness. He lacked the spirit of positive, unyielding, indomitable and heroic constancy, so characteristic of Luther. The two chief Reformers were cast in widely different molds. While the nature of Luther displayed the hardy vigor of the oak, Melanchthon's occasionally showed the pliancy of the reed. This is abundantly attested by the annals of the time. It is a notable fact that in great emergencies, when Luther was absent, and after his decease, Melanchthon exhibited at times a want of firmness, a spirit of faint-heartedness and wavering tendencies that almost imperiled the success of the Reformation. We see his faint-heartedness during the period of Luther's retirement in the Wartburg after the Diet of Worms; when the Anabaptist fanaticism gained a partial ascendancy even at Wittenberg; and before and after the Diet of Augsburg, when almost despairing of ultimate success, he appeared ready to make concessions to the papacy that would have materially injured the Protestant cause; in the controversies that sprang up in the Church after the death of Luther, almost imperiling its very existence; in the Adiaphoristic controversy, from 1548 to 1555, concerning the admissibility of Catholic forms in the constitution and worship of the Church; in the Majoristic controversy, from 1551 to 1562, turning on the necessity of good works; in the Synergistic controversy, from 1555 to 1567, concerning the freedom of the will; in the Crypto Calvinistic controversy, from 1552 to 1574.

concerning the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. It is a well known fact that the anabaptist fanaticism acquired its influence and gained ground while Luther was at the Wartburg with Melancthon at the head of affairs; and that on the return of Luther to Wittenberg it immediately lost its influence: and that the weakness shown by him during the meeting of the Augsburg Diet, and the periods known as the Augsburg and Leipsic Interim was nearly always manifested in Luther's absence. It is known, too, that the four great controversies mentioned, which tended to tarnish Melancthon's fame, took place after the death of Luther. D'Aubigne acknowledges that "Melancthon after the death of Luther hesitated and gave way; even where he should not have yielded." Without the strong faith and courage of Luther to assist him, Melancthon seemed as little able to conduct the movement of reform, as Phaeton without the assistance of Apollo, was capable of driving the chariot of the sun. Realizing his own weakness, he leaned on Luther, regarding him as God's principal agent in the prosecution of the work. During the Wartburg period he wrote to a friend: "Our Elijah is at a distance from us, his absence absolutely torments me." At Augsburg he writes to Luther at Coburg: "O, my father, I do not wish to exaggerate my sorrows, but, without your consolations, it is impossible for me here to enjoy the least peace." His admiration for Luther and confidence in his steadiness breaks out in the sentence: "Nothing can terrify Martin Luther, who would willingly purchase the glory of the gospel at the price of his blood." At an earlier period he exclaims: "If there is anyone I dearly love and embrace with my whole heart, it is Martin Luther." Overwhelmed at the thought of the loss he had sustained in the death of the great reformer, he utters the cry of Elisha at the departure of Elijah: "My father! My father! the chariots of Israel, and the horsemen thereof." In his funeral oration over the remains of his friend, he speaks of him tenderly as "Our most beloved father and teacher." On another occasion he wrote: "I should rather die than be torn from Luther." Thus loving, revering, admiring and trusting, Melancthon was willing to occupy the second position, instead of aspiring to that

of leadership in the labor of reform. These noble spirited men were bound inseparably in a covenant of love, the affection shown by Melanchthon, being fully reciprocated by Luther, who writes: "Whatever we know in the arts and true philosophy, we owe to Philip. In the wide world, the sun shines on no man who has such gifts as Philip. He that lightly esteems him, must be lightly esteemed before God."

One of the most important of the later works of Melanchthon, was the preparation in 1551 of the *Confessio Saxonica*, for presentation to the Council of Trent. This confession written at Wittenberg, was read before the Elector and Lutheran Theologians at Leipsic, receiving their unanimous and cordial approval. Melanchthon himself styled this confession, the *Repetitio Confessionis Augustanæ*. Of this confession, Kurtz says, "In it we discern no trace of the vacillation and duplicity of the Leipsic Interim. On the contrary, the true doctrine is set forth positively and polemically with firmness and confidence; though in moderate and conciliatory terms." His last public conference with the Papal party was held at Worms in 1557. The subject of discussion was, The rule for judging in matters of religion. In this controversy, the Papists as usual upheld the authority of the Church, while the Lutherans with equal unanimity affirmed, that the only infallible rule for guidance in doctrine and worship was the written word of God! But his work was nearly done; the days of Melanchthon, so abundant in labor and fruitful in results, were drawing to a close; his last years were embittered by the controversies prevailing in the Protestant Church, and the personal abuse heaped upon him by the papists on the one hand, and those who accused him of departing from genuine Lutheranism on the other, so that he longed for death. A few days before his departure, he penned his reasons for not fearing death, in two columns. The first column contained the six following reasons. "First: We shall come to the light. Second: We shall see God. Third: We shall contemplate the Son of God. Fourth: We shall understand the mysteries we could not comprehend in this life. Fifth: We shall know why we are created such as we are. Sixth: We shall comprehend the union of the

two natures in Christ. The second column contained but two reasons, First: We shall no longer sin. Second: We shall be delivered from controversies, and the rage of theologians." His last day of life was spent in prayer, and the reading of God's word. His celebrated reply to Casper Peucer, who asked "if he desired anything"—"Nothing but heaven,"—has become historic. At length on the nineteenth day of April, 1560, at a quarter before seven in the evening, the spirit of Melancthon took its flight, in the sixty-fourth year of his age. His exact age was sixty-three years, two months, and three days. His last word, addressed to Vitus Winshemius, who asked if he understood the Scripture reading, was the German word, Ya! His remains, placed in a leaden casket, after a sermon by Paul Eberus, and an oration by Winshemius, were deposited by the side of Luther, in the Church at Wittenberg; where his ashes still repose. Above his resting place is carved the following epitaph:

"Hic inviete, tuus collega, Luthere, Melancthon
Non procul a tumultu conditur ipse tuo.
Ut pia doctrinæ concordia junxerat ambos,
Sic sacer amborum jungit hic ossa locus,"

of which the following is a somewhat free translation: Here, unconquered Luther, thy colleague, Melancthon himself, lies buried not far from thy tomb. As holy harmony in doctrine had united both, so this sacred spot unites the bodies of both.

In a study of Melancthon's life, his chief characteristics claim our attention. We notice, first, his great industry and constant application; not even Luther could excel him in these directions. His entire life was one of activity; each day being devoted to some useful employment. With a frail body, he was an intellectual Hercules. The marvel is, how, with so delicate a frame, he managed to perform such incessant and exhausting labors. One of his biographers says: "Like the apostles, he was instant in season and out of season; to counsel with tongue or pen, to travel, attend private conference or public council, neither time nor labor was grudged, if it could be used in promoting the peace and purity of the Church." He was a man of candor. The thoughts he expressed were the convictions of

his intellect and heart. If he sometimes sacrificed his own convictions, it was only to promote the peace and welfare of the Church. Along what he regarded as lines of secondary importance, where principles he deemed vital and fundamental were at stake, Melanchthon could stand as firm as Luther. In a letter to Granville, the imperial commissioner, he declares his abhorrence of all evasion, mental reservation, or any species of disingenuousness, in public disputation or private conference. He was a man of great humility. This quality he daily manifested. Says one of his admirers: "Humility was one of the signal features of his character. In him we have no great impressive personality, winning his way by massive strength of resolution and energy; but a noble personality we cannot study without respect and love." The piety of Melanchthon was deep and unaffected. Loving God's cause, God's word and Church, he was willing to sacrifice all, even life itself, for the sake of truth and righteousness. Modesty was one of the predominant qualities of his nature. A striking incident illustrates this attribute. At the Diet of Ratisbon, when Eck put to him a difficult question, Melanchthon, after a pause, replied, I will answer you to-morrow. Oh, said Eck, with a sneer, "There is no honor in that." "Good Doctor," was the memorable reply, "I am not seeking personal glory in this matter, but defending the truth; I say then, God willing, you shall have an answer to-morrow."

A man of unusual mildness, he occasionally erred in giving too free scope to this amiable quality. And yet, while regretting the extent to which he carried this characteristic, for it led him sometimes too far in the path of conciliation, we admire and love him for the amiability he possessed in so prèminent a degree. It is recorded that his meek and quiet spirit never forsook him.

He always engaged reluctantly in disputation, and no matter how hard pressed, never manifested irritation in the least degree. This quality was strikingly displayed during the Adia-phoristic controversy, in a letter to Flaccius in which he writes: "I yield, I contend no longer about these *rites*; I am chiefly solicitous that the churches live in concord and peace." Schaff

says: "Nothing is more prominent in Melanchthon's temper than its irenic tone. He was mild by nature, and shunned contentions and divisions. And yet in spite of his mildness his life was a conflict: he himself with Luther was a centre around which circled the storm currents of strife."

Despite his conciliatory tendencies, however, he could be both sharp as well as firm, when occasion required. Where, for instance, even in the sayings of Luther himself, will you find keener and crisper sentences than these: Disputing with an Italian on Transubstantiation, he exclaims, "How is it you Italians will have a God in the bread, since you do not believe there is a God in heaven." Again, "There is no more reason for adoring the bread in the sacrament of the supper, than water in the sacrament of baptism." Again to Eck, at Ratisbon: "The sacrament, has no significance beyond its divinely appointed use, and Christ is not present for the sake of the bread, but of the recipient." This statement staggered even Eck, set Granville to thinking, and filled Luther with such admiration that he exclaimed in ecstasy: "Admirable Philip! Thou hast seized from the Popedom what I should not have ventured to attempt."

In forming an opinion of the great men of history, we should know how they were regarded by the men of their day, as well as by those of a subsequent era. The data from which to form our judgment of Melanchthon from the sources indicated is excellent, and abundant. From the mass of testimonials we have but time and space to refer to but few. Let us start with Erasmus. In the very morning of Melanchthon's life, when he was but eighteen years of age, the renowned scholar of Rotterdam writes: "What hopes may we not conceive of Philip Melanchthon, almost a boy, and yet to be equally admired in both languages (Latin and Greek). What quickness of invention, purity of diction, vastness of memory, and variety of reading, what modesty and gracefulness of behavior, and what a princely mind. God grant that this young man may long survive us. He will entirely eclipse Erasmus." "Thanks to him," writes Plank, "Wittenberg became the school of the nation." Luther exclaims:

"The whole Christian world is his debtor; and, thanks be to God, the popish fraternity are more afraid of him, than all the learned beside combined." Again Luther wrote: "*Res et verba, Philippus; verba, sine rebus, Erasmus; res, sine verbis, Lutherus; nec res, nec verba, Carolostadius.*" (Philip, is both substance and words; Erasmus, words without substance; Luther, substance without words; Carlstadt, neither substance nor words.) Again writing to Melanchthon from the Wartburg, Luther shows his appreciation of his coadjutor in the words: "If I perish, the Gospel of Christ will not perish; and you, I hope, like another Elisha, will succeed Elijah." Bossuet speaks of Melanchthon as the most able and zealous follower of Luther; the most eloquent, polite, and moderate follower of the Saxon reformer. Mosheim exclaims: "His greatest enemies have borne testimony to his merit; they have been forced to acknowledge, that the annals of antiquity exhibits but few worthies to be compared with him." Archbishop Lawrence of the Church of England says: "Melanchthon possessed every requisite to render truth alluring, and the Reformation respectable." Kurtz writes: "He was an Erasmus of loftier power and nobler mien, a complementary counterpart of Luther." Luther and Erasmus both lauded his talents, his fine culture, and learning, and his age pronounced him "Preceptor Germaniæ." Fisher, of Yale, says: "He had a fine but cautious intellect, and exact and ample learning. He won fame alike as theologian and expositor. His commentary on the Epistle to the Romans laid the foundation of Protestant exegesis." The highest compliment Hugh Miller can pay to Dr. Gordon, one of the heroes of the Kirk, is to say: "He had a head of the Melanchthon type—high, erect, with an overpowering superstructure of sentiment." Schaff pays him the high compliment by declaring: "Melanchthon's moderation and conservative tendency were as necessary to the success of the Reformation as were Luther's heroism of faith and bold and military nature." Luther writes: "I was bound to fight with rabble and devils; for which reason my books are very belligerent. I am the rough pioneer who must break ground; but master Philip comes along softly and gently; sows and waters

heartily, since God has richly endowed him with gifts." "Our Philip Melanchthon," again writes Luther, "is a wonderful man, having scarcely a single quality, in which he does not surpass all other men. Rich in learning, in Latin, in Greek, young only in years, familiar with all books in every department, acquainted not only with the classic tongues, but possessed of their treasures, and not a stranger even to the Hebrew tongue. Though I be a master of arts, of philosophy, and theology, I give up my opinion at the dissent of this grammarist, as Eck calls him; I have done it often, I do it daily, for the sake of that divine treasure which God has poured into this earthen vessel. It is not Philip I honor, it is the work of God in him I revere."

Such are a few of the opinions concerning this man by those best qualified to render an intelligent and impartial judgment. And we who at the distance of four centuries study his character, labors, influence, and life, are forced to acquiesce in the favorable opinions, so forcibly expressed by the ablest men of the present and the past.

We have witnessed the influence of Melanchthon's work in the Reformation era. It will be germane at this time to inquire, what influence, if any, does he exercise in the Church of to-day? We hesitate not to declare that Melanchthon's influence instead of waning, in some directions at least, is still in the ascendant. By virtue of the fact that the Augsburg Confession, written by him, is not only the doctrinal standard of the Lutheran Church throughout the entire world, but the source from which the Church of England drew the Thirty-Nine Articles of the English confession, as Archbishop Lawrence of that church frankly acknowledges in his Bampton Lectures, and as Dr. Fisher asserts in his history of the Church, the influence of Melanchthon will continue to be felt, as long as these great churches continue to endure. But with the churches mentioned, that influence does not stop. The twenty-five articles of Methodism, largely based on the Thirty-Nine Articles of Anglicanism, may with justice be claimed indirectly at least, as an outgrowth of the Augsburg Confession, so that the Methodist Church also is indebted to Melanchthon. The slightest acquaint-

ance with the Westminster Confession, with the Dort and Heidelberg Catechisms, will show numerous phases in which these confessions agree with the confession of Augsburg, and, as the latter was the first prepared of all the confessions named, it is safe to say, that the Augsburg Confession was consulted by the authors of the later confessions, and that the portions in such confessions agreeing with the Confession of Augsburg, were substantially drafted from that Confession into the later productions. Kurtz says: "The Reformed Church of Germany occupied from the beginning a middle position between Calvinism and Lutheranism, which was closely related to Melancthonism." Dr. George P. Fisher, writing of the Mercersburg Theology, says: "Into the Heidelberg Catechism, the Creed of the German Reformed Church, there had flowed influences from the school of Melancthon." He also states, that as against Calvinism, Melancthonism was brought by that theology, (the Mercersburg) into the foreground. This statement, if correct, shows that even as against Calvin, Melancthon's influence is predominant, even in the school of Nevin and Schaff.

It is now pertinent to ask the question, how should Melancthon be regarded by Lutherans? What position is he entitled to occupy in the estimation of the Lutheran Church? It is a well known fact, that after Luther's death, Melancthon in his desire to conciliate all parties, thus promoting peace and unity in the Church, made concessions, which, instead of accomplishing the end contemplated, lent color to the charge that he had abandoned the Lutheran position on the sacrament, and tended to alienate from him the affections of the more determined followers of Luther. So bitter was the feeling excited against him in ultra Lutheran circles, that Dr. Leonard Hutter, Professor at Wittenberg, in the early part of the seventeenth century when the authority of Melancthon was appealed to in his presence, tore down Melancthon's picture from the wall and trampled it under foot. But the tide of opinion has long since turned in his favor; and in this four hundredth anniversary year of his birth; in spite of his mistakes and failings, we hail him as a true Lutheran, a devout and earnest Christian, a genuine man of God,

a true spiritual hero, the second champion of the German Reformation, the life-long friend, faithful coadjutor and unflinching defender of the prince of reformers. Theologically and historically it is impossible to separate him from Luther. It has been well said of these eminent men: "They were not always perfectly agreed, but always perfectly united; that the miner's son drew forth the metal (of truth) and the armorer's son fashioned it." There are pairs of names and personal histories so inseparable blended and interwoven, that the mention of one invariably recalls the other. David recalls Jonathan; Damon, Pythias; Peter, John; Paul, Timothy; Washington, Lafayette; Luther, Melanchthon. The last two taught together in the same university, translated together the word of God, battled together for the overthrow of error and the establishment of God's truth. Together they stood before kings, rulers, magistrates, hierarchies, potentates of all kinds, secular and ecclesiastical. Together they prepared sundry manuals of religious instruction, that the people might be grounded in the holy principles of the oracles of God. Together they gave to the world "the greatest of uninspired documents," the Augsburg Confession. Inseparable in life, they are inseparable in death; their bones mingle in the same sepulchre; side by side they sleep the tranquil sleep of the just. So long as the principles of that great Reformation shall endure, so long will the names of Luther and Melanchthon be held in honor and their memories be revered.

It will not be deemed inappropriate in closing this article to consider briefly the question: Did Melanchthon, late in life, abandon the Lutheran view of the real presence in the Eucharist for the Calvinistic conception of the mere spiritual presence of Christ? The Calvinistic church holds to the affirmative of this question, and the opinion generally prevails in that communion that their contention is true. We think, however, it can be clearly shown that such was not the case. The impression that Melanchthon changed his ground in the direction mentioned, originated in two different ways: First, because of his personal friendship for Calvin, and his ardent desire to unify the Church,

Melanchthon refused to condemn the Calvinistic view of the sacrament, thus lending color to the idea, that he endorsed that view. Secondly, Casper Peucer, Melanchthon's son-in-law, who himself became a Calvinist, publicly announced that Melanchthon also had adopted the same opinions. This however was after the death of Melanchthon, when the latter of course could neither affirm nor deny the statement.

We answer the charge that Melanchthon became a Calvinist as follows: At no time in his entire life, can it be shown that in his views of the sacrament, Melanchthon openly declared, I endorse the view of Calvin. Regarding the first point mentioned, Kurtz explains Melanchthon's position as follows: "It was Melanchthon's most ardent desire to effect such a union (of the Church). He became convinced, not indeed that the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence was erroneous, but that Calvin's doctrine of a spiritual participation of the body and blood of Christ (through faith) in the Supper, did violence to no essential religious point; therefore he sought to avoid what seemed to him an unessential difference in confession and doctrine." Schaff says: "The personal presence of Christ, and the impartation of himself in the Lord's Supper, were matters of supreme importance with him." Again, "*Above all*, he made prominent the union with Christ and the mystical body, but he always seems to represent this as mediated by a carnal impartation by Christ of himself."* These statements of Kurtz and Schaff show that in the opinion of these eminent historians, Melanchthon was simply induced to withhold his censure of the Calvinistic view, in the interest of peace, and with the design of avoiding controversy, and that he retained his personal belief in the biblical and Lutheran position of the Lord's Supper. So that the contention of the Calvinists, that Melanchthon abandoned the Lutheran view, because he did not openly oppose the Calvinistic theory, falls to the ground. It is poor logic to claim, that whosoever does not openly condemn a theory, must necessarily himself be an advocate of that theory.

*Kurtz's Ch. His. Vol. 2, pages 136, 137, Edition, 1871. Cyclo. of Reli. Knowledge, vol. 2, Page 1459.

Regarding Peucer's claim that Melanchthon had embraced the Calvinistic view of the sacrament, we reply: "First, that Peucer and Melanchthon were separated from each other for years; and that Peucer's opportunities for understanding the doctrinal position of his father-in-law were not greater than those enjoyed by many who never ceased to regard Melanchthon as a Lutheran. Secondly, Peucer being a layman, immersed in his medical calling, and not a theologian, might easily have been mistaken in his judgment concerning Melanchthon's position. Thirdly, without desiring to be uncharitable, it is possible to conceive that Peucer, having embraced Calvinism, might be tempted to excuse his own change of belief, by ranging Melanchthon on the same side. But apart from these conjectures, we have what we consider the most direct testimony in opposition to the Calvinistic claim. In addition to the testimony of Kurtz and Schaff already cited in favor of Melanchthon's Lutheranism, the learned Bishop Bossuet writes: "Calvin obstinately maintained that a believer once regenerated could not fall from grace; Melanchthon agreed with the Lutherans, that this doctrine was damnable and impious. Calvin could not endure the necessity of Baptism, and Melanchthon would never depart from it. Calvin condemned what Melanchthon taught on the coöperation of free will, and Melanchthon believed he could not recant. *As for what concerns the Supper, Calvin boasts that Melanchthon was of his opinion; but as he does not produce one word of Melanchthon's clearly to that purpose, but on the contrary taxes him in all his letters and books with having never explained himself sufficiently on that subject, methinks one may reasonably doubt of what he has advanced.* * * *I shall only say, what candor and truth oblige me to, viz., that I have nowhere found in any of the author's [Melanchthon's] writings, that Jesus Christ is not received, except by faith.* * * *Neither do I find that he has ever said, with those who maintain it, that the unworthy do not receive the true body and true blood; but on the contrary, it appears to me that he persisted in what was determined on this subject in the Wittenberg agreement."** This impartial opinion of the great Catholic his-

*Bossuet's *Variees*, Vol. 1, 293-94.

torian should settle the question of Melanchthon's Lutheranism in every unbiased mind. Schaff says (Cyclope. of Relig. Knowledge, p. 1461.): "He [Melanchthon] insists on his doctrinal agreement with Luther;" and Dr. Schaff surely was thoroughly familiar with the doctrinal position Luther maintained. I have already called attention to the fact, that in 1551, five years after the death of Luther, Melanchthon drew up the *Confessio Saxonica*, which so entirely agreed with the Lutheran theology that it was unanimously approved by the Elector and Lutheran theologians. Six years later, in 1557, three years before his death, at the last Diet of Worms, he again signed the unaltered Augsburg Confession. In 1560, the year of his decease, he again signed the *Confessio Saxonica*, or as he styled it the *Repetitio Confessionis Augustanæ*. This last fact, apart from all other considerations should absolutely settle the question of Melanchthon's Lutheranism, and clear his reputation from whatever odium has been cast upon it in this respect. It shows clearly that in the sixty-fourth year of his age, the last of his earthly life, he placed himself on record as being a Lutheran and not a Calvinist. A few weeks before his death, he penned a last preface to his Body of Doctrines, embracing with other writings, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Repetition of the Confession, and the Examen, all thoroughly Lutheran. In view, then, of the facts cited; in view also of the fact that Chemnitz and Chytræus, two of the most eminent Lutheran theologians of the sixteenth century, with Nicholas Selnecker, never doubted Melanchthon's Lutheranism; that Bossuet a Roman Catholic, Kurtz a Lutheran, and Schaff a Reformed historian, all acknowledge the Lutheranism of Melanchthon; that neither Calvin himself nor any of his followers have presented a single unquestioned fact corroborative of their claim that Melanchthon embraced Calvinism, we claim that, beyond all controversy, Melanchthon lived and died in the faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

ARTICLE III.

THE CLASSICAL LANGUAGES IN EDUCATION.*

BY REV. PROF. J. HOWARD STOUGH, PH. D.

One of the first Latin sentences I learned, after I began the study of that language, was the familiar proverb, "*Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis*—times are changed and we are changed in them." The first part is a truism as old as history; the latter part may be true or it may not. Times may change but man and human institutions may set themselves against these changes and preserve the features of a distant past amid the surroundings of the present. The great hermit nation of the East retreating behind its wall and sealing its ports against the outer world, for several millenniums stood still and uninfluenced by the vigorous, pulsing life of the West. Yet even that nation was reached at last, and it may be a question whether the silent influence of changes that occur about us can be finally and fully warded off. However this may be, it is true that changes as a rule come slowly. Reforms are not wrought rapidly. The masses tend toward conservatism. There will be those who, like Cicero, looking upon the present as a degenerate age and back to the splendor and strength of the past, will cry out in bitter irony, "*O tempora! O mores!*" and the aging men of every period will be found "praisers of the days when they were boys," but most men, whether young or in their prime, will be found according a hearty respect to that which has the sanction of antiquity. Hoary-headed age, whether in man or in institutions, demands and merits reverence.

But there are some men who, in defiance of all precedent, strike out into new paths. The past is not infallible, and having discovered some real or fancied mistake in that past they often

*An address delivered at the opening of Midland College, Sept. 9, 1896.

proceed to discredit the whole. The powers of the human mind are beyond conception great, and all that the past has done and all that the daring present proposes to do has not exhausted those powers. And so there is a field for the reformer,—mistakes are to be set right; there is room for the progressive man,—new discoveries are to be made, new realms to be conquered. The one supplements the other. Without the radical the world would stagnate; without the conservative the world would run wild.

Of these two tendencies we have evidence on every side if we are but attentive to what is transpiring about us. We have a *new theology* which takes some remarkable liberties with God's word and, like the image breakers of the Middle Ages, would demolish some cherished ideas which we have inherited; but side by side with it we have an *old theology* which holds fast to the "faith once delivered to the saints," a theology which has been tried in storm and stress and gives firm anchorage to our faith. It is not strange, therefore, to find that we have also a *new education* as well as an *old education*, and that these are differentiated from each other in spirit, methods and aims. The one is iconoclastic, the other is conservative. But iconoclasm is usually destructive. Those wild men of the Middle Ages, who tore down the images and smashed the beautiful windows and hewed the carvings of the cathedrals, destroyed what they had not the skill to replace. Conservatism, on the other hand, may mean the truest progress. This question between the new and the old is exceeding broad and we may not venture upon it now. There is one feature of it, which touches our work of higher education, which is of special interest to us. It is the question of the *Classical Languages in Education*.

Before I can answer the question so often asked—"What is the use of Latin and Greek in these latter days?"—I must know what you set forth as the educational ideal, what is the thing aimed at in education. There is one side which arrogates to itself the name *practical*, which claims to represent the spirit of the age, and can see no good or advantage in the classics. In the view of these persons, time spent upon these languages as subjects

of study is simply time wasted. The touchstone by which they would test every subject is its *practical* value—its value in dollars and cents, its help in getting bread. Whatever does not bear directly upon this is to be discarded, and all human energy is to be concentrated upon "getting on in the world." The classic languages of Greece and Rome cannot be turned into dollars, either gold or silver, in the world's markets, and therefore are not to be sought for. They belong to a dark past, to those days when men believed in and sought for the philosopher's stone. The preservation of them in college courses is an anachronism—or, to use one of our vigorous and expressive slang terms, a "back number"—a fetich which college professors have succeeded in preserving till this day, and have imposed on the suffering generations lest they should lose their professional positions and salaries. They are out of all harmony with the aims and purposes of the coming century, as they have been the blight upon the growth and progress of education in the waning century. Such is the wail which the editor of *The Cosmopolitan* sends forth in a recent number in an article meant to be satirical, but too untrue for satire and too weak to pass as argument. And under the pressure of this intense commercial spirit great changes have been inaugurated. The great strides which the natural sciences have been making have naturally placed them in the front ranks as competitors for a place as educational agents. The result, however, is not reassuring. Pres. G. Stanley Hall, one of the leading authorities in this country on educational matters says: "Those sciences that bring bread have been taught and those that are educational have been dropped. Many of our institutions have dropped astronomy because it is not money making, because there is no astronomic industry. Organic chemistry has flourished like a green bay tree; inorganic chemistry which is more exact and more scientific has steadily declined. Electricity which happens to be a money making thing, has boomed everywhere. * * Go through the list of our American scientific studies. They are what the Germans call *bread studies*. We have weeded out educational studies. and brought the practical, money making studies into the fore-

ground, and many of our schools and teachers are in danger of sinking to be the tools or agents of the factories. The college has moved a great many leagues nearer the factory than it ever was before in this country."* This is expert testimony, not of a Greek Professor, but of a professional educator of national reputation, upon the tendencies of the new education.

Now there is another ideal which says that "*it is a greater thing to make a life than a living*," that man's mind was made to be something better than a counting machine, that conceives of his mission both for himself and his fellows as something higher than mere money making, that makes education as broad as man's nature and seeks to inform, to discipline and cultivate all his faculties. It is called *liberal* and is described by the one word *culture*.

If *the all* of education is simply to prepare for the active fight of life for bread and position and money, then my answer must necessarily be that there is little use for the classical languages. But it would be just as true that there is as little need of a great many of the branches which are just now contesting the ground with the classics. Mathematics saving the barest skeleton would have to go, for what man ever thinks of solving any of our practical problems by any but the simplest methods, and none but the engineer would have any need of any of the higher branches of that delectable science. And to the man whose mission is to buy and sell, or to dig and plow, or to wield the hammer or drive the engine, what *practical* benefit could come from Milton or Shakespeare, from Browning or Tennyson, and with this great and glorious company must be thrust aside art and oratory, music and poetry. The man who is to measure off calico needs neither chemistry nor logic; the man who enters politics will find ethics very inconvenient to practice, and psychology for the blacksmith certainly is non-essential, while the lawyer and doctor will need enough mathematics of the simplest kind to figure out their bills and to reckon interest. Education by this standard becomes a very simple thing. Teach

*Report of Regents Univ., of N. Y., 1894, p. 305.

the thing the boy or girl will most need and which will aid most in the work of bread-winning and you have the whole thing in a nutshell. If such an education satisfies those who wish to thrust aside the Latin and the Greek, I am satisfied. But I would insist that they stand by their theory even though that practically reduces education to the three R's. However, it is safe to say that no one wants such an education; they want the privilege to be illogical and unreasonable in the choice of that which shall constitute an education.

Let me now take up some of the objections which are urged against the classics.

1 *They are a relic of the past, and a semi-barbarous past at that.* Latin and Greek were taught in the schools and universities partly because they had little else of a character suitable to be the subjects of study; and partly because these languages were then practical, for the Latin at least was everywhere spoken and was the language of the Church, the court, the palace, the school. To speak and write a pure Latin was an accomplishment of value, while to read and understand the Greek was the mark of the scholar. But times have changed. Latin is now a dead language. It is not needed "on change" or in the courtroom. It should be laid aside with the battering-ram, the cross-bow, the Ptolemaic theory of the universe and the Pythagorean transmigration of souls as curiosities for the antiquarian. And this age, this wonderful age, this boasted and boastful nineteenth century, and these last days have ushered in such abounding wisdom that the veriest ignoramus "understands more than the ancients" and is wiser than all his teachers. And so the cry, "Away with the Latin! Away with the Greek! Away from the sixteenth century!" was started and many have joined in the hue and cry without stopping to ask whether there was any particularly sound reason for it or not. It is of the past, and the past ought to be labeled and shelved. That is reason enough.

But let us look soberly at it. Whether these languages were introduced for the reason given we may leave for the historian to settle, but the fact remains that they have been prominent factors in liberal culture for more than four centuries and during

all these years have maintained their place without question. Wm. H. Payne, formerly Prof. of Pedagogy in the University of Michigan and a prominent writer on educational topics, lays down as a fundamental principle that "*whatever policy has received the long sanction of the wise and good, is likely to have some elements of truth in it.*"* This seems reasonable, and on almost every other subject would be accepted without hesitation. Applying this principle, on a *a priori* grounds, since the teaching of Latin and Greek has been long employed by the wisest, strongest, best teachers of the centuries past, has held its place during these years, it is likely that there was some good reason for its introduction and its continuance and that it is not so utterly foolish and useless as some would have us believe. The likelihood is that no amount of professional interest or scholastic pride, or conservatism could have stayed its downfall and saved it as a college fetich had it been without value. To impeach the honesty, the candor, the wisdom of the past generations, who have regarded these languages as one of the chief and best instruments of human culture, is both ungracious and a piece of foolishness which only the conceit of this age could produce.

2. *It is objected that students know but little about them when they are graduated, and that in a few years even that little has in most cases utterly vanished.*

Granting that this may be true, and yet by no means in as great a degree as is assumed, let us go aside a step and make a practical application of the principle that we may see how it works. You and I studied somewhere in the years that are past a process called the extraction of the cube root. Were I to put a problem on the board how many of you could step up and solve it without going back to the old arithmetic? Shall we therefore throw away that wholesome old book because we have forgotten most of its rules, or work out our problems by other and shorter methods? Some of us studied surveying and could accurately compute areas from a surveyor's note-book; or from given data we could figure out a ship's course or position in

*Contributions to Science of Education, p. 20.

longitude and latitude. But *to-day*, how about it? Once we could parse the long and involved sentences of Milton. But could we make even a creditable showing now? The *pons asinorum* was a famous proposition in geometry in my boyhood. Some of you doubtless have had some experience with it, but I doubt if there would be found, in every hundred, ten who retain any adequate idea of the method of proof, and a still smaller number who could give the wording of the proposition. And calculus, and the optical formulæ, and the chemical names and symbols, and the botanical terms, and the dates in history, and the formulæ of logic, and the definitions of rhetoric—where are they? Latin and Greek seem not to be the only things we learn only to forget. But shall we discard these subjects from our course of study because we will forget them? Certainly not; for these things belong to formal science and, while the matter may have disappeared, the *effect* of the study accompanies each intellectual act. Prof. Payne again says: "In the region of taste classical study is formative in as true a sense and in as great a degree as in the case of mathematical study; and if we admit, as I think it must be admitted that the better half of culture is concerned with taste, feeling and emotion, it follows that the classics are culture studies in a preëminent degree. So far is it from being true that the value of a subject for culture can be tested by the residue held in the memory, that *it may rather be affirmed that knowledge can be transformed into faculty, taste, power and character only on the condition that it lose its identity.*" Expert testimony again.

And this objection so far as it may be allowed as an argument is rather against the poor teaching of the classics than against the classics themselves. Right here it would be just as well for all of us to be humble. I do not think that the teachers of any one branch or division of knowledge are so free from fault that they can point the finger at the Greek professor and say like the Pharisee, "Lord, I thank thee that I am not as other men are * * or even as this publican." The fact is, that the history of education is the history of a series of experiments, some of them brilliant successes, some dismal failures, and pro-

gress has been made only in this way. That the methods in vogue for many years have to answer for much of the present hostility or aversion to the classics, I am quite sure. But a new day has dawned. New ideas are getting abroad. New aims are being set before the teacher, and new methods have been devised. Classical teachers are beginning to see that even the grand old blind poet of Greece with his charming stories, his wonderful word pictures, or the mighty thunder of Cicero, or the sweet songs of Horace, are tame and uninteresting, dry-as-dust, when used simply as parsing exercises. They realize that there is a humanity throbbing and pulsing through these old authors not unlike that life which beats in our own bosoms. They are seeking for and using all that has been done in art, architecture, the uncovering of buried cities, the opening of long forgotten tombs, the dredging of rivers to make that old life new and real. But where outside of the great universities do you find equipment for this work? There are balances and microscopes, air-pumps and batteries to illustrate science; cyclopedias, dictionaries, poems, orations, histories, books without number for history, literature, and logic; but the classical teacher, with a branch one of the most difficult, is thought to be amply equipped if he has his text-book, a last century dictionary and a school grammar. The history, the art, the genius of these old nations must be studied and when the teacher of Latin and Greek can be furnished with the necessary apparatus at a cost of about one fourth of the sum expended for science or English literature, we may expect a decided increase in the interest, enthusiasm and practical benefits of these studies. The scientific method can be applied to no branch with greater success than to the classics, but for such laboratory work equipment is an absolute necessity and to require or expect such results without it is but a modern case of "bricks without straw."

3. *It is objected that what is gained is impractical knowledge, that is a knowledge which cannot be put into practical, daily use in the business of life, a knowledge which has no direct equivalent in terms of dollars and cents.* Before we discuss this objection please notice how delightfully inconsequent the logic.

At first the objection is that they learn no Latin or Greek, or so little that it amounts to the same thing. Then they straightway forget what they have *not* learned. And at last we are met with the statement that what they have *not* learned and yet have forgotten is after all impractical knowledge. And now granting for the sake of the argument that this objection is true, we may reply that very much knowledge is of that sort. We never use it. We did not expect to use it when we spent hours and strength upon it. If you go through any college curriculum and strike out everything but that which is *practical* in the sense in which this word is used, you will have precious little left, and that little by no means presents a justification of the college, the university and the higher schools. This all rests upon a mistaken idea of the mission of the college, and what a college education should do for a man, an idea that thrusts at the college, and the classics as a very vulnerable point in the college work. The object of a college education, as defined by an opponent of the classics, is "to fit a man for the world, for life; to give him knowledge, exactness, thoroughness; to enable him to follow out a line of sustained, close thought, expressing himself in clear, concise terms." To this definition we shall return shortly. According to it, the work of the college is to train men to *think*, to strengthen their mental and moral muscle and fibre, to give them ability to *do* something when they are ready to determine *what* they will do. The special work a man will do being decided, the special school fits him for that work, gives him the technical, professional knowledge necessary. The college does not pretend to teach medicine, or theology, or law, but it is supposed to fit him to enter successfully on these professional studies. I said "*supposed* to fit him" advisedly, because objectors often point triumphantly to notorious failures. We have now to add that education is not a patent process conducted after a fixed formula, but it deals with quantities which are in part unknown and with factors which cannot always be managed. The result expected presupposes two things—*diligence* and *capacity*; and it is well known to all teachers, though not so clear to all parents,

that all students do not possess these two qualities. Some are capable enough but lack in diligence; some are diligent but lack in capacity. When now a college has failed to do what was fondly hoped for and expected, it is possible that it is the fault neither of the subjects taught nor of the methods employed, but comes from the large personal factor in the problem.

Now to recur to the definition just cited, we contend that the study of Latin and Greek really fits a man better than anything he could study in their place for the highest usefulness in this active, bustling, hard-hitting, many-tongued world, full of living issues. *This study is practical*—the very thing which this age worships; and should therefore be cultivated and retained. And I give my reasons for the faith that is in me.

1. *The tools are the most perfect ever put into the hands of man.* Remember what it is that education proposes—"to fit man for the world; to give him the power of sustained, close thought and to express himself in clear and concise terms." A good workman may do good work with poor tools, but it is much better to give him the best. Of these two languages the Greek has by far the most perfect system of grammar among all the tongues of earth. This statement does not mean that necessarily it was the best language, but that the formal element had been reduced to a regular scientific form. This shows a highly developed stage of language. Some of you may think this strange as there rises before the mind's eye the grim specter of the famous irregular verbs, but even these were regular in their irregularity—they came regularly from the word you did not expect. And the language, of course, from which the grammar was drawn was a language wonderful in its flexibility, its power to express every idea which the mind of man could conceive. There is but one language, in my opinion, that approaches it in this respect, and that is the German, but it is heavy and cumbersome beside the grace and capacity of the Greek. How rich the German is in its auxiliaries—its helping verbs! But what the German had to express by these helpers the Greek expressed elegantly and clearly by a mere variation of form.

Add to this language, which philosophy has made her mother

tongue, the language of Rome. It is not so complete or copious in its grammar but how clear, how concise as was befitting the language of law! "The act of composition and the knowledge of its theory went hand in hand. Among Roman classical authors scarce a sentence can be detected which offends against logical accuracy or defies critical analysis."* And what strength! It moves along with the steady tread of her legions. The union of this perfection of form and this perfection of strength provides an instrument for discipline which the world has done well to use for more than four centuries of educational work.

The very process of translating makes these languages fruitful. Translating is simply transferring an idea from one language to another in such a way that as little as possible of the beauty or force of the original may be lost in the process, while at the same time guarding against any accession to the idea. A translation that adds to the beauty or force of the original is not a translation. In much translating both faults are prevalent. Some authors have a beauty that is peculiarly their own or a style so suited to the genius of the language they speak that brought over into any other tongue this personal, native flavor and fragrance is lost. Shakespeare in German is another being; Schiller in English is tame and dull. Luther's "Ein feste Burg" has been the despair of translators for three centuries. The Odes of Horace, by whatsoever hand they may be done, have lost something, while Jowett's Plato is English, beautiful, clear, strong English, but English still, not Greek. And this very task employs the highest faculties of the mind. The student before he can express in terms of English must first clearly grasp the idea which his Latin or Greek author intends to convey. This is sometimes hard to do even in English. To lay hold of these ideas requires attention, a concentration of the mind upon the thing to be done. Even with this the task is but half done. There remains the clothing of the idea with new words—to fit to it other words which shall be so well chosen that the picture in your mind passes over to the mind of others unchanged. Here with every change and every phrase there

*Crutwell's Hist. Lat. Lit., p. 2.

comes into play the judgment and the exercise of taste. Words and their meanings must be carefully discriminated that the best and fittest expression of the idea be chosen. Wide differences hang upon the meaning of some particle or the shading which a preposition may give. And is not this *practical knowledge*? Is it not a training which leads to practical results? What is it that the lawyer needs, that the physician must have, that the practical business man must possess, if they are to succeed? Is it not *accuracy*? And will not the training which makes a man able to estimate the force of a Greek particle or a Latin preposition give him power of mind to interpret a law, diagnose a case, or write and understand a contract? How many laws are inoperative which are just and equable in their provisions and ought to be executed, but were drawn by men who did not know the meaning of words or understand the laws of language! How many contracts are violated by men who have small sense of honor, because the contract was faultily worded! And our courts are full of cases which could have been prevented by accuracy of thought and expression.

2. *The classical languages are practical just because they are what men who deal in cheap ridicule call "dead languages."*

While we are at it, we might as well say that the honors are about even on that score. I doubt much if a Greek root is much deader than a trilobite, or a mollusk or a mastodon's tooth; at any rate it is modern as compared with them in point of age, if we are to believe the half that science so confidently asserts. But they are valuable as agents for discipline just because they are *dead languages*. Their form is fixed. What they are to-day they have been for centuries, and will continue to be. The meanings of words do not change. When once you have grasped them you have something. Every new word is an acquisition, an addition to your capital. The modern languages, English French and German, are all living languages. They are passing through their various stages of development and have not reached that stage where their forms are crystallized into the shape which they shall wear. For purposes of discipline it is one of the essentials that the thing with which we deal shall be

constant—that when employed it shall reach the same result again and again, and that what is employed as true to-day shall not be something else to-morrow. Consequently mathematics has always been used for discipline. Centuries ago Plato wrote over his school, "Let no man enter here without geometry." Two and two make four to-day and forever. When you have learned that the shortest line between two points is a straight line you have gained a principle which is true to the end of time. You will never have to revise or reverse your conclusion. And very much in the same way, though not to so great a degree possibly, the classic languages are valuable for discipline. Your rule deduced from examples to-day holds good to-morrow. But the *science* of yesterday, to-day is discredited; and everything indicates that our science will last but to-day and to-morrow it will be something new. And this uncertainty preëminently disqualifies the sciences as factors of *educational* value. They may develop observation, but so does Greek; they may teach you the process of induction but so do the languages.

And the languages which are put forward as substitutes—what of them? When you come to make the comparison, let it be remembered that the use and study of the classics is not a late "fad" or fancy, but that they have been tested by quite four hundred years of actual use, and that in this length of time they have been profoundly studied, their results have been analyzed and their value established beyond dispute. And while the classics are old and tried, the substitutes proposed are comparatively new and untried. The study of English both from the standpoint of national pride in the tongue of our own race and country, and its practical value and interest, is not to be underrated. I would by no means be understood as depreciating the study of English, but it has been taught in our schools too short a time to dogmatize on its value as an *educational* branch. When it has been taught for a century and its results are known and a basis broad enough from which to generalize has been gained, when it has produced a generation of scholars and writers who write English and not doggerel and dialect, it will be time enough to settle the question of its claims. There is no nobler

page in the history of the human mind than that which records the glories of English literature, but you will remember that what is *literature* in English is the product in a very large degree of classical culture and of the influence of classicism upon education. John Stuart Mill was a man with but little of the antiquarian in his mental "make-up," a man with but little reverence for the past because it was past, and one whose literary judgments were unbiased in an unusual degree. He says: "Even as mere languages no modern European language is so valuable a discipline to the intellect as those of Greece and Rome, on account of their very regular and complicated structure. In these qualities (the qualities which make a language valuable for study) the classic languages have an incomparable superiority over every modern tongue." Hear another piece of testimony. George P. Marsh says: "So far from dissuading from the study of Greek as a branch of a general education I do but echo the universal opinion of all persons competent to pronounce on the subject in expressing my own opinion that the language and literature of ancient Greece constitute the most efficient instrument of mental training ever enjoyed by man, and that a familiarity with that wonderful speech, its poetry, its eloquence, its philosophy and the history it embalms, is incomparably the most valuable of intellectual possessions."* And the great Tayler Lewis, one of the brightest lights of American scholarship, one of our nation's greatest teachers, said: "It is my deliberate judgment from the observation of a lifetime that if you want a man to master science let him study Latin three years and science one year and he will know more science at the end than if he had studied science four years without the Latin."†

3. *I hold these studies to be practical also because of the dependence of our language and literature upon these two languages.*

Archbishop Trench estimates the Latin and Greek words in the English at thirty-five per cent. of the whole vocabulary. Prof. Hadley in his essay on the English language in Webster's International Dictionary says that the words of foreign origin in

*Lect. on Eng. Lang., p. 95.

†Quoted by Dr. King, Regents Rep. Univ. of N. Y., 1894, p. 854.

the English are a decided majority of the whole number. Of these imported words, which certainly are not less than sixty per cent. of the whole, all but about five per cent. are from the Greek and Latin, in which is included also the number from the French as a descendant of the Latin. And Meiklejohn in a text-book on "The English Language" says: "The majority of words in the English tongue are not English. In fact, if we take the Latin language by itself there are in our language more Latin words than English."* Here I am reminded that this same author states that by far the larger part of the words in actual daily use are Anglo-Saxon in their origin rather than classical; and while I grant this is true, you will find that the numerical majority comes largely from the small words, the articles, particles, prepositions, conjunctions and the like, which are of very frequent occurrence. These connectives are necessary to the frame-work of the language but no one would assert that they constitute the language any more than coupling pins and links make a train of cars. The important thing is the word that is big with meaning, the word that constitutes the pivot of the sentence, and that word more often than not is a word whose form proclaims unmistakably its foreign origin.

And when we come to literature the case is even stronger. The author just quoted says: "We may say without any sense of unfairness or any feeling of exaggeration that until the Latin element was thoroughly mixed, united with and transfused into the original English the writings of Shakespeare were impossible, the poetry of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries could not have come into existence. This is true of Shakespeare; and it is still more true of Milton. His most powerful poetical thoughts are written in lines the most telling words of which are almost always Latin."† He might have added that one of the elements of Milton's strength lies in the fact that his order of words is almost regularly the inverted order which we find in Latin and which is so constantly, but so unjustly berated. In close harmony with what has already been quoted we have a

*The Eng. Lang., p. 281.

†The Eng. Lang., p. 287.

couple more to add. One from Geo. P. Marsh, who says: "No one would think it possible to compose an epic, a tragedy, a metaphysical or critical discussion wholly in Anglo-Saxon."* The Chief Justice of England in an article in *The Youth's Companion*, counseled young lawyers to study carefully the "*Corpus Juris*"—the body of the Roman civil law. He says: "A great body of our law finds its source in the Roman law; and in the *Corpus Juris* that law is presented, systematized in a way for which our English law has no parallel."† In his mind Latin seems to be both practical and profitable from the legal point of view.

If we go still deeper we find that even our boasted civilization has its roots far back in these two nations and the ideas for which they stood, and that these national ideas and ideals modified by the presence and power of Christianity have made the world what it is. Look back into the Latin and see what words it gives us expressive of moral character—such words as *honesty*, *honor*, *self-restraint*, *probity*, *patriotism*, and with the words have shown us the thing itself in the Roman character. The Greek has opened to our eyes visions of science, art, architecture and literature; it invented all the potent literary forms, the epic, lyric, dramatic, pastoral, and not only invented but lifted up these forms to perfection. It has given us our language for science and philosophy. It might be too bold to say that we could have no science or philosophy without Greek, but as a matter of fact we have none that does not show in its very vocabulary the influence of that matchless tongue. Even our literary men, some of whom have caught the infection of the age, owe all that in them is worth preserving or worthy study to the influence of these two old world languages; and our literature is what it is, and our civilization, through these *dead* but speaking languages.

4. I add one other reason—the *intrinsic value of the literature itself*.

The literature of Greece and Rome is unrivaled. Such has

*Lect. on Origin and Hist. Eng. Lang., p. 57.

†*Youth's Companion*, Feb. 13, 1896.

been the verdict of the ages, which cannot be set aside by bold assertions. To decry Homer, to belittle Demosthenes, to underrate the eloquence that thrilled Rome, to discount the sweet music of Horace or the grace and beauty of Vergil is but to give public exhibition of conceit and to proclaim one's ignorance. Time has pronounced upon their merits, and their laurels are secure. It is the most original, the most artistic, the most varied, the most stimulating product of human genius. "Their line has gone out through all the earth." All modern civilization feels their impulse. All modern literature holds them as its standard of perfection and struggles to reach their matchless perfection. Call the muster roll of the ancients! Who has surpassed in epic that blind poet, Homer, so far back toward the beginning that his name and history is only less mythical than the story he writes! Who has ever thought more profoundly or come nearer the solution of the problems of life and destiny than the proto-martyr of philosophy, Socrates, and his pupil Plato! Who has rendered a greater service to formal science than Aristotle! What dramatist has ever surpassed in power and human interest the Greek triad, Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides! What tongue has ever wielded language more persuasively or with greater power than he who stands easily first in oratory! And it is no mere coincidence that the age which produced these great minds and the land in which they flourished was also the land of Phidias and Polycletus and Scopas, the home of the Parthenon, the Phidian Jove, the Hermes of Praxiteles and the temples of the gods. Nor was it a mere happening that the fulness of God's time came when this world-language, this universal tongue developed and enriched beyond any other tongue by centuries of profoundest thinking, was everywhere prevalent. It was a tongue fit and capable to proclaim the new and startling thought of salvation by faith to the nations of mankind. To every Christian it must always be sacred as having embalmed in its imperishable forms God's latest word to man; and no scholar will ever be satisfied with his at-

tainments until he has sought in that distant past the seed which has blossomed into the harvest of the present.

And if that literary canon be true that what impresses us in any production is the *form*, the shape which it takes under the master's hand, then may the world still go to school to the ancients. The masters who have taught the world are there.

"On the heights of this literature, those who are worn with the troubles or disturbed by the mental maladies of modern civilization can breathe an atmosphere which, like that of Greece herself, has the freshness of the mountains and the sea." "Humanity cannot afford to lose out of its inheritance any part of the best work which has been done for it in the past. All that is most beautiful and most instructive in those achievements is our permanent possession; one which can be enjoyed without detriment to those other studies which modern life demands; one which no lapse of time can make obsolete and no multiplication of modern interests can render superfluous."

ARTICLE IV.

THE LINE OF CLEAVAGE.

ESSENTIAL DOGMATIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE LIBERAL AND POSITIVE SCHOOLS OF THEOLOGY.

BY REV. GEORGE U. WENNER, D. D.

The conviction that we are living in a critical period, or at least are approaching a crisis in religion and in the history of the Church is shared by all. But as to the significance of this crisis, there is a difference of opinion. To some it is a sign of Antichrist and of impending judgment. To others it is the dawn of the coming kingdom. Whatever view we take of it, it is important that we should at least have some knowledge of the movements themselves, and be able to locate them and define their relation to one another.

The task is made difficult by the necessity of considering intellectual causes that lie far beyond our times and that have had a potent influence in determining present conditions. There are

causes in mind as well as in matter. It is true, man has freedom, and hence intellectual development is not of the same kind as physical development. It is also true that there are spiritual forces which no man can explain, which again and again have swept away ancient systems and brought about a new creation in the hearts of men and in the life of the Church. But ordinarily we are subject to the logic of intellectual facts as truly as to the law of gravitation.

The theological period in which we live is generally conceded to date from Schleiermacher. He died in 1834. His epochal work, *Die Glaubenslehre*, was published in 1821. This remarkable period therefore, still an unfinished chapter in the history of the Church, began within the memory of men who are still living. Schleiermacher owes his unique position not so much to his transcendent ability, as to the genial manner in which he absorbed the results of the religious thought of preceding generations, cleared the table of useless rubbish, and prepared the docket for the new period which he ushered in. The items, if we may so speak, of the theological estate which he was called upon to administer, were the general results of the Reformation, the dogmatic theology of the seventeenth century, the pietism and the rationalism of the eighteenth century, and the philosophical systems of Kant and Hegel.

To characterize Schleiermacher's system in briefest form is to say that he places the home of religion in the heart. Christian consciousness has and expresses religious truth without regard to the question whether science leads to it or not. Intellect and feeling are forever together and yet forever separate. Like the two poles of the galvanic battery, they are necessary to each other but can never meet or supplant each other.

While his place in the theological world is unique, his place in the religious world is not so easily determined. All parties claim him and, with few exceptions, all parties have derived from him impulses which are felt to this day in most widely differing schools of thought.

We cannot understand the period without a brief outline of its philosophical tendencies, so far as they relate to theology.

According to Zoeckler, there are three main currents, the speculative, the radical, and the critico-rationalistic. The first class are Hegelian idealists. In the person of Christ they distinguish between the ideal and the historic Christ, the Christ of faith and the Jesus of history. Their great leader was Baur, and Holtzmann and Hausrath are among his followers. The radicals were led by Strauss, and include Feuerbach, Bruno Baur, the Darwinistic evolutionists, the advocates of monism. Opposed to these evidently anti-Christian extremes stand the critico-rationalists, whose object, while preserving the fundamental ideas of Christianity, is to discover its substance by a historico-critical method and thus to mediate between philosophy and religion. The chief names that meet us here are Weisse, the younger Fichte, Otto Pfleiderer, Biedermann, and the neo-Kantian Lipsius of Jena.

For the religious classification of the period we may use the terms right wing, left wing and extreme left. To the right wing belong the orthodox Lutherans of Hengstenberg and the Erlangen and Leipzig schools. Also the moderate Lutherans, such as Neander, Tholuck and Beck. Also the Reformed, such as Hagenbach, Pressense, Godet, Schaff. To the left wing belong the writers in the Jena Year-books, Baur's school, Kuenen, Stanley, Seeley. To the extreme left belong Ritschl and his school. As his place has in theology not yet been absolutely defined, a few words of characterization are necessary. He has cut loose from all philosophy. Metaphysical statements of our faith rest on a use of reason that transcends its proper boundaries, and hence are not justified. On the other hand, he points to Jesus Christ as a real historical personality, a divine revelation, not merely a religious idea. This revelation in Christ is for him the only dogmatic foundation of knowledge. The believer has here a firmer foundation than all speculation can give. Against the method of his system, it is objected that he inserts into the documents ideas that cannot be deduced by unprejudiced exegesis. As to its substance, the mystic element is not sufficiently recognized, because of his fear of bringing in metaphysical ideas. In the high-priestly office of Christ he has pelagian views. He de-

nies that Christ was punished for us. Hence it is doubtful whether he has an adequate view of sin. Nor does he teach a real conferring of salvation, but only a change in our consciousness. Not so much our relation to God is changed, as our knowledge and opinion of that relation. A few years ago the Ritschlian movement threatened to carry everything before it in Germany. It is a factor that we shall have to reckon with in America before long.

This introduction was tedious but it was necessary. It affords the elevation from which we may look down on the surging sea of theological opinions whose dogmatic differences it is my purpose to define.

In doing so, I disclaim all pretense of originality. I have simply collated the facts as best I could from the guide books I had at hand and present the result of my examination. For the history of the eighteenth century, I have used Kahn's *Inner Course*. For the nineteenth century, Frank's *Geschichte und Kritik*. Also Zoëckler's *Handbook*, and especially the *Unterschied* of Robert Kübel, late Professor in Tübingen. Life is too short to read all the books that are published in Germany, to say nothing of the English and American reprints. Luther's catechism I still find a safe and competent guide in the mazes of dogmatic strife.

The first general division that occurs to us is the distinction between those who hold tenaciously to the traditional doctrines of the Church and the Bible, and those who vary from them to a greater or less degree. We may call them the conservatives and the liberals. But in the first class there are degrees of conservatism. There are those who adhere so closely to the old views that they will not admit even changes in terminology. Others believe as firmly in the old truths but are willing to restate them in modern language. So also among the liberals there are radicals who answer with Strauss to his own question. "Are we Christians still?" with an emphatic "No." But the great majority are simply desirous of putting new wine into new bottles, and are not averse to mixing a little of the old wine with the new. Some of them have been suspected of placing old

labels on the new bottles. For our purpose we may safely eliminate the two extreme classes. The radicals have practically no existence in modern theological thought. And the ultra conservatives are of too little importance to demand serious consideration. We therefore have to deal only with two opposing trends which are usually known as the positive and the liberal schools of thought.

In Christianity there are two factors, the divine and the human. The relation which men's minds take to these two factors determines the development of Christian thought. It is a healthful scientific development when the one is not ignored, no matter how much the other may predominate. The conflict of ideas wages between these two. Now it must be conceded that the theology of the Church is mainly controlled by the divine factor. Christ is essentially divine, and the life that he brings is essentially that which will be realized in its fulness only in the world to come. In the theology of the Church, the Scriptures, which tell us about Christ, are essentially God's word, inspired in a peculiar manner by the Spirit of God. Hence the active determining force in the theology of the Church is an objective, divine authority. The human factor is not ignored, but it is essentially passive. The danger here is that from the religious point of view the moral will be entirely lost sight of. Wrapped up in the contemplation of heaven, men will have no time to think of this world and the responsibilities of this life. Thereupon, against the teachings of the Church, or at least against the so-called dogmas of some of its representatives, there springs up a reaction. But this reaction may itself readily become extreme. Putting aside objective divine authority, it appeals to the authority which it finds in man's own inner life. Reason is made the final arbiter in matters of faith, and we have rationalism. Or the will, and we have moralism. Or feeling, and we have fanaticism.

Now the traditional view of the Church is the one which the positive school maintains, and in doing so, it places the emphasis on the divine factor in Christianity. Over against this view there presents itself, not indeed for the first time, for we have

had heretics in all ages, but with an intensity which has never before been equaled, an energetic attempt to revise or at least to modify the traditional standpoint, and in doing so, the emphasis is placed on the human factor in Christianity. The adherents of this school are called liberals.

But while we hope to present distinctly the line of cleavage between these two schools of thought, we disclaim all personalities. For this reason, men's ethical views may hold them in one school while their dogmatical views place them in another. The boundary lines are not straight, but serrated, or rather like the shore line of a continent. Besides, the heart and the mind do not always agree. We shall not unchurch ministers because of their views in scientific theology. Whether they should be admitted to the pulpit, is a question for their own churches to decide. A touching illustration of this non-agreement of heart and mind is found in the life of Biedermann, one of the leading representatives of the critico-rationalistic school. In his old age he wrote to Professor Frank, with whom he had previously had no correspondence. He said he would rather associate with men of views opposed to his own than with the men of his own school. Referring to an article which Frank had written, in which he had criticised Biedermann and had said to all of his school, "Keep your hands off of Christ. For you he is incommensurable. He does not fit into your categories." He said: "No indeed, neither my heart nor my hand will I take away from him, and that too in precisely the sense in which you would forbid me." In his last illness he occupied himself with words of Scripture and was consoled by the hymns of Gerhard. A friend wrote to him and referring to the Saviour's reply to the dying thief, who had asked only to be remembered by him in his kingdom but had received the promise of an infinitely greater blessing, said: "With the thief on the cross, you too know what sin is. May the Redeemer from sin and death be very near to you." He replied that the letter had caused him the deepest joy and was an echo of his own thought. The friend who reported the incident, said, "his heart was superior to his system."

An exhaustive discussion would take us through the entire course of what is known to old-fashioned people as systematic theology. But my time will permit me to touch but briefly on two subjects, the Scriptures and the Person of Christ.

On the subject of the Holy Scriptures, while the contest has been exceedingly hot in Germany, there have been in some respects fewer difficulties there than elsewhere. The Lutheran Church is not committed to any theory of inspiration. Nothing was clearer to Luther than that the Scriptures were the word of God. Every word, every letter, he says in one place, outweighs all the treasures of earth. On the other hand he freely criticizes books which in his opinion are lacking in gospel quality. Thus the Epistle of James he thinks has a great deal of straw in it. The Gospel was the touchstone which he applied to the books, by which he measured their quality. The same spirit permeated all the official utterances of the Church.

The dogmaticians of the seventeenth century, it is true, drew up some finely spun theories of inspiration which included even the vowel points of the Hebrew text, but these were theories only and never composed any part of the Church's confession. For this reason, the Christian thought of Germany has been less hampered by artificial restrictions than some other churches of which we have heard. Some eminent positive theologians of our day have made large concessions, for example to the critical school of Baur, without in any respect surrendering an essential position.

On the other hand, with the exception of a few radicals, the liberals are at one with the positives on the question whether the Scriptures are indispensable to Christianity. Both Pfleiderer and Lipsius in their way concede this, and so also does Ritschl. The cleavage takes place when we consider the *what* the *how* and the *why*. Even as to the *what*, there is to some extent consensus. Many leading liberals have conceded that if a doctrinal system is to be obtained from the Scriptures, it will agree substantially with that of the Melancthonian Lutheran Church. Rothe did not believe in dogmatics, but nevertheless he said he could cheerfully subscribe to the system of Nitzsch. And Nitzsch is positive.

The liberal dissents from the positive, first, in respect to the authority of Scripture. Authority is established not by objective character alone, nor by subjective experience alone. There is authority when we bow to a superior power and accept its sway, whether we have experienced the beneficence of its laws or not. Have the Scriptures such authority or have they not? The positive says yes. The liberal says no, or if he says yes, it is with such reservation that it is equivalent to no. He admits its authority in so far as it may express the mind or the spirit of the congregation, that is I suppose of the enlightened Christian consciousness. But the Scripture is not a doctrine in the strict sense of the word, something that is taught and that it is our duty to learn, in other words objective truth. The Scripture contains the ideas, the conception, the popular impressions of the times in which they were composed, are important as historical documents. They reflect the ideas of their time. They are valuable only in so far as they succeed in presenting from out their husk that kernel of truth which we in our inner consciousness recognize as religious truth. Says Lipsius: "It is no directly divine doctrine, but it is a word of God, clothed in fallible human diction." Such a view enables us to sit in judgment on what we regard the fallible conceptions of the biblical writers, and to put them aside as not binding whenever we see fit to do so. Every page of Biedermann, Pfleiderer, Lipsius and the men of that class shows that when they are speaking of Paradise, angels, devils, miracles, certain phases of the atonement even, and especially of eschatology, they are dealing with what in their view are legends, myths, conceptions of the times and various forms of popular superstition. As for Ritschl,* he treats St. Paul as though the latter were a freshman in college about to be conditioned for imperfect recitations. What his followers† of the left wing say it is unnecessary to quote.

Among the positives there is without doubt a wide range of

*Cf. *Rechtf.* II. (1st ed.) p. 313 ff., 248 ff.; III., 415 ff., 303 ff., 316 ff.

†Gottschich, *Bedeutung der histor. Krit. Schriftforschung*, 1892. H. Schultz, *Gottheit Christi*, § 419 f.

opinion. Some of them tread dangerously near the liberal lines, nevertheless the distinctive mark, the line of cleavage is that they recognize the Scriptures as objective divine authority. Gess is still as positive when he says, "The Bible is not God's word, but God's word is copiously present in the Bible. The liberal Haupt finds out by experience that the Bible is God's word, and therefore he says for me it is God's word. There are positives also who appeal to experience, but not to that of the individual, but to that of the whole Church. Luthardt and Thomasius speak of the universal experience which the Church in all ages has made of the truth of Scripture. Luthardt says: "The Scripture is norm for the Church and contains the saving word of God for the individual." Kaehler shows that the Scripture is not simply the word concerning Christ and him crucified, but that it is the sum total of revelation. Its authority rests upon the experience of its efficacy as a means of grace.

There certainly must be something which the Bible teaches in answer to the chief questions of religion, especially something that Jesus and his Apostles taught, and this *Didache* must be something clothed with objective authority, which we cannot ignore, but which, if we are Christians, we are bound to believe and to accept as final truth. It is not necessary here to define what that truth is, but it is sufficient to have indicated that the positives recognize this infallible authority and that the liberals do not.

A second topic which we ought to consider is the literary character of the Bible, or the Bible in its human origin. And the third topic is the question of inspiration, or the Bible in its divine origin, both of them questions of intense interest. But my limits will not allow me even to touch upon them. But enough has been said to indicate the direction which the line of cleavage would necessarily take. I hasten therefore to the second general subject which I proposed to illustrate, the Person of Christ.

What think ye of Christ? This is the fundamental question in the Christian catechism. All schools, even the liberals, recognize Jesus as the Son of God. But what do the liberals

mean when they use this term? Hermann says: "The term divinity of Christ does not trouble us." Ritschl loves to speak of the "predicate" or "title", "divinity of Christ." Kaftan's idea of the divinity of Christ is that Jesus is "the man in whom God permits the fulness of his eternal being to abide so that he becomes for us the image of the invisible God." Lipsius thinks there is no material difference between those who debate over the signification of the expression "divinity of Christ," since we all believe in the divinity in Christ." And Ziegler says that he is in perfect accord with sincere orthodoxy so far as the relation of his heart to Christ is concerned.

The positive school declines to accept these honeyed words as a basis of brotherhood. Behind them all is the conviction that Christ is man. We believe that Christ is God.

Biedermann says: "The essential content of the dogma of the God-man is not found in the determination of the unique person of Jesus, but in the new idea which made its appearance in humanity for the first time in the person of Jesus, that of our filial relation to God." It is the Christian principle to which we owe our redemption, which he defines as "the self-consciousness of the finite spirit in regard to the absoluteness of spirit." The first development of this principle faith sees in the personal religious life of Jesus. His life is therefore a guaranty of the efficacy of this principle. The historical Jesus may therefore be regarded as worthy (!) of being considered the historical Redeemer for all times, the fountain of the efficacy of the principle of redemption in history. Lipsius too distinguishes between the religious principle and the historical person of Jesus, although he admits that they are united in him. Pfeleiderer loves to use the word spirit instead of principle, but that he also is a worshiper of that unknown philosophical quantity, is evident when he says "Christ" is that historical personality in whom and through whom the Holy Spirit of Godsonhood or Godmanhood has become a historical reality. He is the type of the Godmanhood. He is the microcosmic Godman over whom the macrocosmic Godman will tower as an infinitely enlarged copy." From these quotations it is clear that to all these theologians the nature of Christ is purely

human. Of pre-existence or of virgin birth, it is useless to speak. As Lipsius says: "Divinity of Christ means that the consciousness of Godsonhood appeared in him and was disclosed by him to the congregation."

As to the continued existence of the exalted Christ, the question is either more or less ignored by the men I have named, or with Lipsius they declare that we can have only a fantastic conception of its nature. We may love him as we love Luther or any other historical character. Hence we can worship him, according to Pfeiderer, only in the sense of John 14:9: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." It is a churchly custom that ought not to be given up. Prayer to God is to be commended, because in doing so we seek deliverance from the pressure of the evil of this world, and in communion with the divine life we find this deliverance. But in reality it is only a symbolical act. Our prayers are heard, in so far as we have an inner experience of the results of faith. Outwardly it will manifest itself in the world-overcoming power of faith.

Very different is the position of the Ritschlians.* Over against the critico-rationalists whom we have considered, they seem almost to speak the language of Canaan. What makes Christ God is not the principle of Lipsius, but the sum total of the significance of the historical person of Christ. True religion is the supernatural independence of the spirit over against nature and society, and an experimental knowledge of the paternal love of God. This is possible only in the Christian congregation, the founder of which was Christ. In philosophical terms we can only have *Werturteile* in regard to him, which I suppose means, in the language of the Church, that we know nothing about his nature, only about his office. Certain expressions of the master seem to concede the resurrection, and among his followers there seems to be forming a right wing whose views approximate those of orthodoxy. In the inchoate condition of this school it is difficult to form a just judgment. But certainly

*Harnack, *Das ap. Glaubensbekenntniss*, p. 38. (Ritschl, *Rechtf.* III. p. 364 ff., 370 ff. *Unterricht* §13, §19).

among his followers of the left wing,* the supernatural in Christ is nothing more than is peculiar to human nature.

The positive school holds with Luther that only he who is *natura* God can redeem us. The historical Christ was indeed man, but God who had become man. Christ is not only of divine worth, [*Wert*] but of divine being. Thus Dörner shows that Christian consciousness feels the need of connecting the person of Christ with the trinitarian idea of God, and this takes place in the doctrine of the *logos*. He of course defends the virgin birth. This subject has recently come into the foreground through Harnack's fight against the use of the Apostles' creed in the new liturgy of the Prussian Church. I remark in passing that the new liturgy with the apostolicum was adopted a year ago by the General Synod with, I believe, not one dissenting voice.

This then is the positive standpoint, belief in the divine personality of Christ, that is, personal divine pre-existence. Pre-existence implies post-existence, and the transition is the resurrection. All positives without exception maintain the resurrection as an external historical fact. The only use the liberals have for Christ now is that he is the head of a moral kingdom, that is, he represents the idea of such a kingdom, and his followers owe allegiance to him in the Christian life. He is in fact a new lawgiver, a kind and loving one, it is true, at least he represents that idea, but nevertheless a lawgiver, and the Gospel has to give place to a new code of morality.

With such views of course there can be no personal relation to the ascended One. As for prayer in the sense of petition, in the strict sense of the word, stripped of all phraseology the liberals deny its efficacy. Is it not clear that their religion is different from ours, and that there is a gulf between us which cannot be bridged over.

We believe in Jesus Christ. It was his voice that said to us long ago, Go in peace, thy sins be forgiven thee. And when we err from him to-day, we cry out, O Jesus, have mercy upon us. And him we need continually. Not a principle, not an

*H. Schultz, *Gottheit Christi*, pp. 334, 352, 378, 451, 476, 511, 495, 564.

idea, not a new morality, not even a world-conquering faith, but we need Jesus. In him we have life, and him we hope to see with clearer vision when we come to die.

Him therefore the Church will continue to worship and to him she will address her sweetest songs :

"Jesus, thou joy of loving hearts !
 Thou Fount of life ! Thou Light of men,
 Thy truth unchanged hath ever stood ;
 Thou savest those that on the call ;
 To them that seek thee thou art good,
 To them that find thee, all in all."

ARTICLE V.

CHRIST'S GLORIFIED HUMANITY AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY REV. S. L. KEYSER, A. M.

To our mind, there has not been a sufficiently well defined attempt made, in recent discussions of the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Lord's Supper, to give the scriptural and philosophical basis for belief in that doctrine. If we may make so bold, we would humbly suggest that there have been too much dogmatism and mere assertion and too little proof ; too much quotation from theologians and too little appeal to God's word, the only infallible rule and standard. Can we not attain to such a view of the glorified humanity of Christ as will be in harmony with God's word and with the laws of right and clear thinking ?

If we examine the New Testament carefully, we shall find that Christ promised his disciples that he himself would come to them again after he had been absent for a little while. He said : "I will not leave you comfortless : I will come to you ;" "If a man love me, he will keep my words ; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him ;" "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you ;" "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." These passages, and many others that

might be quoted, prove that, while Christ promised the gift of the Holy Spirit, he also promised just as clearly and unmistakably that he would himself come again; not at the last day merely, but during the life of the first disciples, for he said, "I will come to you."

Now when did he come? If we read the vivid narrative of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, we shall see. In Acts 2 : 32 and 33, Peter gives the explanation of the wonderful scene that had just been witnessed: "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." This much is certainly clear in the foregoing passage—that Christ, having ascended to the right hand of God, was glorified, received the Holy Ghost, and came again at Pentecost and poured the Spirit upon the waiting disciples. He did not baptize them with the Spirit from a distance, from the remote heavens, or the right hand of God, but he literally fulfilled his promise to come again and baptize them and abide with them.

That Christ is not made a prisoner, so to speak, at God's right hand in heaven, is evidenced by Paul's experience on his way to Damascus when the light shone round about him and he fell to the earth. The narrative says plainly that the wonderful colloquy that followed took place between the Lord and Saul. "Who art thou, Lord?" cried Saul. Note the answer: "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." It is evident that Christ must have been really present, for Paul afterward contended that he had seen the Lord, had seen him as one born out of due time. However mysterious it may seem, Christ was not only able to be with Paul at this time, but could also make himself visible. How much more, then, must he be able to be present with his disciples in his invisible, glorified form!

The Scriptures clearly teach, therefore, that Christ is present with the believer, and also that the disciples, including Paul, recognized him not as the Logos, but as the Jesus of Nazareth whom they had known before his ascension. Yet the Scriptures

teach just as unmistakably that Christ sits at the right hand of God. For example, Paul says in Rom. 8 : 34 : "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather, is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." Other passages might be cited, as Acts 2 : 33 ; 7 : 55 ; Eph. 1 : 20 ; Col. 3 : 1. How are these representations to be reconciled? There is only one way, and that is by accepting the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's glorified humanity. Observe that God is spoken of in the same way in the Scriptures,—in one place as sitting upon his throne in the heavens, and in another place as being present everywhere. The Psalmist said, "Whither shall I flee from thy presence?" As there is a sense in which God's being is centralized, so that he can be thought of and spoken of as sitting upon the throne of the universe, so there is a sense in which Christ is now in his session at God's right hand. But it must also be true that, as there is a sense in which God is omnipresent, so there is a sense in which Christ is present with true believers wherever they are. And this is in perfect accordance with the Christian consciousness. The truly converted person feels that God and Christ are truly present with him, and you cannot convince him that such is not the case ; and yet at the same time he feels just as surely that there will come a time when he shall have a clearer, yea, a perfect revelation, when he shall see Christ face to face and know him as he is. Somehow, Christian experience never confuses Christ's personal presence with and in the believer with his session at God's right hand. It is human logic and speculation that are plunged into confusion on that doctrine.

Our conception of the power and nature of Christ's glorified humanity will greatly modify our faith in regard to his real presence in the world in the totality of his being. Before our Lord's ascension his body seemed to be limited by locality, so that when he was in Judea he was not in Galilee ; but is he thus limited and bound in his glorified state? If so, wherein is the superiority of his present state over his state when he was here upon earth in fleshly form? Nay, if he is fixed at the right hand of God, he is more helpless to-day than he was in the days of his

humiliation; he might almost be said to be a prisoner at God's right hand. Can we believe that our glorious Redeemer is so powerless?

The Scripture teaches that to be exalted to God's right hand means to be endued with supernal power, not to be bound and handicapped by local limitations. What did Christ himself say of his glorification? John 17 : 5 : "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory I had with thee before the world was." Does not this mean that the Christ who had come into history, who took upon himself the form of a servant, was to be clothed with the power and glory of the Logos eternally begotten of the Father? And the Apostle Paul asserts that "in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

A little reasoning from analogy will help us in these reflections. We ourselves are to have resurrected and glorified bodies, which, we understand, are to be under the complete dominance of our purified yet finite spirits; therefore they will be endued with qualities like those of the spirits that possess and control them, and shall no longer be a prison or a hindrance or a weight of any kind. Now if Christ's body was glorified by the infinite Godhead, would it not be filled with like capacity and power? And so our faith should not stumble at the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's glorified humanity, by which—glorious fact! he is able to touch and thrill and redeem all fallen humanity.

Of course our knowledge of glorified substance is extremely meagre. But we have a few data from which to draw inferences. After Christ's resurrection and before his ascension his body was perhaps not fully glorified, but even then it manifested peculiar mysterious powers that it never before displayed. He appeared suddenly and disappeared just as suddenly, and there is no hint of his local and visible presence anywhere during the interims. In one case this strange supernatural power was shown in a marked manner. The disciples were gathered together in a certain room and the doors were shut, and yet Christ suddenly appeared in the midst of them. He either was present with

them all the time in invisible form, and simply made himself visible at the opportune moment, in which case his ubiquity would be proved; or else he came into the room through the wall or the closed doors. If the latter, as William of Occam long ago reasoned, there must have been a moment when his body occupied the same space as a portion of the door or the wall. In this case the fact that a ubiquitous substance may interpenetrate gross material substance would be proved, and therefore that it is not subject to the physicist's law of impenetrability, nor to the limitations of time and place.

Note also that Paul says of the resurrection body, "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body;" and he declares that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven. We must tread reverently here, and must be careful not to transcend the limits of revelation; but would not these citations from Paul indicate that the resurrected and glorified body is so refined, so spirit-permeated, so transfigured that it can no longer be called gross flesh and blood, but partakes of the quality and nature of spirit, though it may not be the same in substance or essence. If this be so, why should we object to the thought of being filled with the glorified humanity of Christ any more than to the thought of being filled with his Spirit? Does not Christ himself say, "I in you, and ye in me?" And was Paul speaking in tropes when he said, "Christ liveth in me?" What does the converted Christian mean when he says, "I have Christ in my heart?" Is he using a figure, which simply means that the Holy Spirit has come into his being? No; he really feels that it is Christ who is in him. He cognizes him as Jesus of Nazareth, the Jesus of the Gospels, who is as real to him as a dear friend whom he may touch with his hand; and he never thinks of him as divided in his nature, partly in his heart and partly at the right hand of God, but as the person called Jesus Christ.

And what is it that makes this experience unspeakably precious, blessedly real? It is the human quality in Christ's nature—that quality that appeals most directly to us, because we are human; that makes Jesus a personal friend and companion to the truly converted Christian. It is Christ's humanity in direct

contact with our humanity. We recognize in him a kindred spirit; one who knows us because he, too, is human; one whom we know because of his sweet sympathy with us. Thus the real presence of Christ in the entirety of his being is a fact of Christian consciousness, and we only lose that glad assurance when, by our unbelief or speculation, we relegate him in the human part of his nature to the remote heavens, and try to content ourselves with the Holy Spirit as his proxy or substitute. Then we sigh in vain for the presence of our Divine-human companion.

Should some one raise the question of the impossibility of Christ's glorified human nature being ubiquitous, we would reply that it is no more mysterious than the doctrine of God's omnipresence. In some mysterious way, too, we know that God's Spirit comes into our hearts. How does he gain such entrance? No one knows. So no one knows how Christ's glorified humanity comes into our being; but our experience proves that he does come in and permeate our whole nature with his gracious presence. Just as spirit is not barred out by the gross material of our flesh, so ubiquitous substance can interpenetrate and transfuse our physical being. If Christ could, before his ascension and complete glorification, pass through closed doors or solid walls, surely he can now press his way into a believer's heart and consciousness.

Perhaps we may now understand the difficult sayings found in the sixth chapter of John, which, however, have no reference to the Lord's Supper, as Luther himself admitted, but which certainly teach a closely related truth. Take the latter part of the 51st verse: "And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." And the 53d to the 58th. We quote the 54th: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day;" and the 56th: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him." That our Lord did not mean here a gross or carnal eating of bald flesh and drinking of blood, but a spiritual nutriment, is evident from what he said in the 62nd and 63rd verses: "What and if ye shall see

the Son of Man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."

This is simply radiant with glorious meaning, if we can but find the key to the interpretation. What is the meaning? We think it is this: "Verily my earthly flesh profiteth nothing in itself; you cannot eat it; you cannot take it into your being as spiritual nutriment. But what if ye shall one day see me ascend to the right hand of God where my flesh and blood shall be glorified and quickened by the eternal Spirit, for it is the Spirit only that can quicken? Then my glorified flesh and blood shall pervade your being, and I shall dwell in you, and become a living aliment, the heavenly manna, of your life. Then my fulness of spiritual life,—of all true life, indeed—shall be the quickener of your life." Thus the Christ becomes life of our life, and his flesh—that is, his glorified humanity—becomes an aliment indeed and in truth, and it stands true forever and ever that the words of Christ are spirit and life. Let us beware how we keep the Christ himself from us, for it is he who paid our debt upon the cross, and therefore it is he only who can impart to us the merits and living effects of his redeeming grace and power. The Holy Spirit has his own functions to perform, such as conviction and regeneration, but he cannot perform the office of the divine-human Christ, who is the life and manna of the new creation; who alone can give fallen humanity the needed human touch of grace and redemption.

Here was the irreconcilable difference between Luther and Zwingli. The Swiss reformer contended that Christ's humanity was at the right hand of God in the remote heavens and could not be elsewhere; Luther, accepting William of Occam's philosophy of ubiquitous substance, maintained that Christ's glorified human nature, as well as his divine nature, could be everywhere with believers. Zwingli said that Christ's corporeal nature was present only by the contemplation of faith, while Luther declared that Christ in his whole nature was *really* present. We think Luther was right. His was the larger, the nobler, the more Scriptural conception of the person of Christ. Whether

he should have given Zwingli the fraternal hand or not, is quite another question.

But has this doctrine of the matchless person of Christ anything to do with the "real presence" in the Lord's Supper. It certainly has. If Christ in his glorified corporeal nature is present with the believer, he must also be present in the Supper in the same way; nay, he would also be present in the bread and wine. Luther believed that Christ's humanity was immanent in nature, which is also waiting for the redemption of the sons of God; so the Reformer believed that Christ was present in the sacred elements, and when the communicant received them he also received the Saviour. How? No one knows. But who knows how we receive God's Spirit? How does he come through the walls of flesh into the soul? If any man can explain that, we can explain how the spiritual body of Christ is received by the communicant. But is Christ received only in the Eucharist? We should answer negatively. He—the whole Christ—is received whenever and wherever the believer accepts him by a living, appropriating faith.

However, in the Eucharist, when the solemn words, "This is my body," "This is my blood," are said, our attention is especially called to the bodily nature of Christ, which was crucified, dead, buried, rose again, was glorified, and came again to be our personal friend and companion. That part of his mysterious personality which suffered for us, made atonement, paid our ransom—that part is especially set forth as by an object lesson in the sacred emblems, bringing more vividly than under ordinary circumstances to our consciousness the human quality in our adorable Lord. At other times we may think more of his divine nature, of his majesty, his power; in the Holy Supper we think of his human nature, his human love, his human touch. For this reason he said with such pathetic tenderness when he instituted the Supper: "This do in remembrance of me."

Let us pause a moment to reflect upon the language used by our Lord at the institution of the Supper. He said: "This is my body;" "This is my blood." Is this language to be interpreted literally or figuratively? The latter, most assuredly. If

you interpret it literally, you have Popish transubstantiation. If the bread really *is* Christ's body, then it must have been transformed, for it once was bread. No, the bread and the wine are symbols. But, mark, they are symbols, not of the absent Christ, but of the present Christ. Therefore Luther's language is clear and consistent when he says that the Lord's Supper is "the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ."

The expressions, "eating" and "drinking" the body and blood of Christ, are used frequently in our catechisms and confessions. Of course, they are Scriptural terms, for Christ used them again and again in the sixth chapter of John; but we are aware that many people cannot divorce them from the thought of oral manducation. Suppose, however, we substitute such words as communion and appropriation. Christ is a person, and we have personal communion with him of the most intimate kind, and we appropriate him as our Saviour and Friend. Suppose we think, too, of his glorious being as permeating ours, filling us with himself, life of our life and flesh of our flesh. Would not such conceptions lift our minds above everything that is coarse and grating to the most refined feelings and susceptibilities? If our Lord, even before his complete glorification, could pass through closed doors and walls, surely our material bodies would be no bar to his pervading and transfusing our being with himself. Pause for a moment and reflect. Could our Lord really save us and transform us into his own glorious image without coming into direct personal contact with us? Christ immanent—that is the doctrine of full redemption.

We close with a word on the subject of Christian experience. Why is it that so many people are constantly groaning and sighing and praying for Christ to come nearer, just as if there were an aching void in their being? The constantly repeated refrain of their yearning cry is, "Draw me nearer, blessed Lord." Not one unkind word would we say of such earnest, sincere longing. But we would ask in all earnestness, If Christ is in us, and we in him, how can he come nearer? Is not the very phraseology we use an evidence of our skepticism; of our thinking of Christ as far away in the remote heavens, instead of be-

ing really present with us; of our unwillingness to believe that he is here? As long as we hold him off by our rationalism, our doubts or our sins, he will not become a real, living personal Saviour to us. What we need in order to have perfect assurance is not to utter more half-skeptical prayers, not to pray all night for a baptism of power, but simply to *believe* that he is present. "The just shall *live by faith*." Let us listen to our Lord's incisive and clarion announcement to the centurion: "As thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee;" or that other peerless word: "According to your faith, so be it unto you." The basal principle of the Reformation is justification by faith; and faith is just as essential to a clear, unmistakable assurance of the real presence of Christ.

ARTICLE VI.

THE OBJECTIVE CONSCIENCE.

BY PROFESSOR M. H. RICHARDS, D. D.

The sesqui-centennial of the College of New Jersey, henceforth to be known as Princeton University, was the occasion of the gathering of men from near and afar eminent in the world of scholarship and letters. The solemnities were marked by the presence of the President of the United States, and graced by his delivery of a public address. During this address he embraced the opportunity of bearing witness to his profound conviction of the supreme importance of the moral character and the religious basis of life as an imperative adjunct of culture and learning; and that which he avowed as his own evidently sincere conclusion was reached and confirmed by the approval and testimony of his audience.

The president is not alone, nor is he the first, in reaching this conclusion. The concurrent voices of many eminent educators and keen observers second and emphasize the verdict that no intellectual excellence, no mere physical training, will suffice for the welfare of a nation or the safety of mankind. The heresy

of "cuteness," is branded as false doctrine; the exaltation of brawn is conceded to be a fatuity as well as a fad; and the pendulum of the best authority after vibrating from the extreme of intellectualism to that of animalism rests, after all its hesitation, at the point of conscience as the true centre.

Observation need not be excessively acute to discern this. Immoral intellectuality always plays the game of life for more points than are in it; and, as an invariable consequence, gets fewer than it could have scored. Immoral animalism is an impossibility for a man, who, because he is a man, must be either moral or immoral, unlike the beast whose physique is all there is of him. Both are splendid incidentals, and enviable acquisitions, but the essential and imperative along with either is the determinative factor of a sound morality whose basis is an intelligent religious conviction as its ruling motive.

Modern society is so highly organized that the domain of an overshadowing intellect is well nigh world wide; and if it be unrestrained by a sense of duty, spurred on only by a selfish greed and ambition, it implies a despotic sway which enslaves mankind to minister to its gratifications. Give it in addition physical force, abounding health and strength, and it fastens its fetters upon a succeeding generation and has time and opportunity to become a dynasty and prolong its sway indefinitely. There was a time when we exalted education, meaning thereby intellectualism, beyond all decency as the one remedy for all evil. That we have added physical force by physical culture has only exaggerated our mistake and its consequent mischief. We have only put more potent weapons into the hands of those ready to wield them against the common welfare; and we have found more ready thus to wield them than for the common good.

Considerations such as these which enforce the moral training of our youth and exalt the domain of character, which consider the direction of effort as more important than its energy and skill, lead inevitably up to the need of study and definition of what this moral sense is, what its proper standard is, whether it falls under the category of that which may be improved by proper training and educated by proper teaching, or not. In a

word, it is the question of the nature of that which is popularly called our "conscience," our consciousness of the moral character of actions. Do we, or do we not, know by our very constitutionality of being what is right and what is wrong? Can conscience be educated, or is it, like our physical breathing, a matter of course? Are we teaching the whole subject with the scientific thoroughness of investigation which its importance demands? Are we educating the conscience adequately, assuming that it can be educated, or are we practically allowing it to grow up as the chance acorn cast fortuitously by a mountain oak?

It would be strange indeed to conclude that the moral sense, unlike that of beauty, of wit and humor, of commodity, of truth, brought with it exact knowledge and instinctive classification. These other senses do not, why should this one? Responsibility for action is the dominating characteristic of man; and any irresistible energy destroys accountability. Even in sense-perception the mechanical operation of the sense organs exacts interpretation; and in that act our judgment is operative, in which operation what the man has voluntarily made himself is no mean factor in his decision. The prior inference from the uniformity of operation which is so conspicuous in our human constitutionality is that conscience, the moral sense, does not embrace inevitably proper classification of what is right and what is wrong, does not invariably detect relation or non-relation to right or wrong, and does not imperatively and irresistibly move the will so that we do what is right and refuse to do what is wrong.

But the conclusion reached from the examination of facts, still more strongly corroborates the inference from man's constitutionality. All the world over, and all time long, man is found to be constituted with this moral sense; and just as firmly as the race is a unit in this, just so clearly it is divergent and contradictory as to its classifications and decisions of the things which are right and the things that are wrong. Even so the will to do right is of higher and lower degrees; and even in the same individual there are readily found contradictions and in-consequent sentiments and irrelevant actions.

The plan of salvation presumes this to be the state of affairs in human nature. It does not originate the moral sense, the existence of which is in the sphere of creation, and not in that of redemption; but it brings to it will-power, and increased intelligence. It does not destroy will-power while enabling it to accomplish action; and it does not present its intelligence in the form of a demonstration. The result is a voluntary merit or demerit, the growth of habit, the culture of the moral sense, both as to sensitiveness and accuracy and in momentum of activity: in the scriptural terms, there is a growth in grace and knowledge, an enrichment in knowledge, an abounding in knowledge, and judgment, an approving of things that are excellent, knowledge of his will in all wisdom, strengthening with all might. All these results are indeed declared to be the fruits of the Spirit, to flow from the grace of God, but yet are just as distinctly recognized as becoming ours by our acceptance, as not being ours because we have exercised the power to refuse or ignore. Were this not so, there would be none of the earnest entreaty to appropriate, assimilate, enjoy all this grace which abounds in the apostolic letters, nothing of the tender and solicitous caution ever present in them which warns us of the perils of disuse and the possibility of losing that which we have.

The whole case stands before us therefore in propositions such as these: our constitutionality includes a moral sense by reason of which we form the concepts of right and wrong, just as we do those of beauty or commodity or truth. These concepts arise upon the occasion of certain sense-perceptions, but they do not classify all our perceptions infallibly, nor classify those of all men alike. In this respect we are educable just as we are as to the beautiful in sight and sound; and a moral art and science and standard are the logical outcome just as they are in painting, sculpture, and music. Finally, we can be trained to a sensitiveness to the moral relation of any state or act far greater than that which is merely spontaneous, as well as to a greater accuracy as to what that relation truly is, and also to habitual conformity of the will and prompt action in accordance with what this judgment has indicated.

The variations found among men in this sphere of psychic activity are readily accounted for when we recognize the three-fold possibility thus set before us of varying factors, since they all depend upon what a man makes of himself, and what he accepts and seeks from the environment in which he finds himself. The result, in every case, is what may be justly called a subjective conscience, which means the form and content of an individual man's conscience. Of this sort there are just as many as there are human beings in whom occasion has set the latent moral sense into operation. No two are alike, to the very fraction of a second; and many differ as widely as the average farm house clock from the great regulator of an astronomical observatory.

But, as in the analogous cases of the sense of the beautiful and the right, there must be a standard by which to judge all these varying subjective consciences. If every man can say to every other man, My conscience is as good as yours; my judgment of what is beautiful is as good as yours; my conclusions in reasoning are just as sound and good as yours, then the very end of constituting these senses in man is defeated: they will not end strife as judges; they will not develop and elevate, being devoid of all magisterial authority; they will not conduce to continuous seeking in the same direction, which is the essence of civilization; but they will inevitably disrupt, resist, alienate the entire race. The fact that civilization does exist, that "common sense" can be appealed to, that standards are accepted and have become well nigh axiomatic in all other directions, is the proof that there is a standard conscience which can best be distinguished from the individual's conscience by calling the latter a *subjective* and the former the *objective* conscience.

Let us make sure of being understood! In literature there is a standard by which we judge the literary product of the individual. His standard has been formed by the process of accepting the literary consciousness of some individual, itself assisted and modified in its formation by that of predecessors and contemporaries, and then, little by little, modifying that by the acceptance of changes made in it by others who, from time to time, obtained the approval of the better portion of those who

had cultivated this literary sense. "Authority" is the term by which we denominate such a supremacy. Our appeal is to this authority; and our rhetorics and dictionaries are the registers of what it has decreed. The authority that is present, national, and reputable settles all disputed points. The man whose literary consciousness or product does not conform to this may have his own opinion of himself, but the opinion of all others whose opinion is worth taking, whose opinion will be worth anything in a generation or so, is that he has become faulty, has obscured and vitiated his literary sense: he is in a hopeless minority; and we conclude confidently that the "common sense" of the ever increasing majority against him is practically an unconditioned, absolute deliverance, a standard, the objective literary consciousness of the race.

In reasoning we find the same logical standard, the same fixed rules and laws which must be observed if we are to reach a correct conclusion. Their formulation and enunciation were just such another gradual growth. But long ago that growth reached the stage of a clear consciousness capable of distinct enunciation. They have been stated, they have been tested, they have approved themselves. Every student of logic finds his acceptance of them grow stronger by every test he makes of them; and he would be a bold man indeed who would now attempt insurrection against them. Without laying claims to prophetic insight or foresight, those who have made these laws a "perfect possession" would rest fully assured that if every logical law were suddenly blotted out of recollection, so that the whole process of forming a standard anew had to begin over again, when it was once more completed it would be just what we have now, as surely as that the correct independent addition of the same figures by different pupils would yield the same result.

It is upon this conviction that we base the use of such a term as "objective." We remember that man has a certain constitutionality; we have certitude that the uniform operativeness of it is to be ascertained and defined by collating the largest possible number of instances, or at least a number sufficient to detect variations and defects and to fasten upon essential and generic

qualities and marks. This then, we say to ourselves, is man, what man was constituted, created to be, what man is, in spite of what some men are. More than this, we say also, This is what man ought to be or become; and he who is not thus does not come up to the standard, the objective manhood.

This "objective" is by no means of the same value or kind as a number of "subjectives" viewed as a mere aggregation! The discovery and subsequent certitude as to it are similar to the feeling produced by the special senses: when we find that not only we but others also have the same experience which the words, "I see a chair," indicate, we are certain that it is because such a thing as a chair exists independently of us or of our consciousness of it. And when we discover and acquire certitude as to these "objectives," we pass into the same conviction that they have existence independent of us or our discovery of them. He who believes in an absolute first cause having personality will say: These are the thoughts of God which I am thinking! He who does not believe in such a Being will either turn these "objectives," which are qualities, into things, or stultify himself by efforts not to believe what he really does believe, if judged by his actions instead of by his words.

The "objective conscience" is then God's own moral consciousness, the divine thought and aspect, in so far as man has discovered it out of his created image and likeness, out of his experimental knowledge, out of the contributions of succeeding generations, out of the especial studies of especially devoted inquirers. It has grown up into a standard which in turn is ever modified and yet ever tends to stability among those of highest attainment. It is identified in all this, along with all other standards, with that which we mean by civilization and enlightenment.

It will naturally occur to one at this point that, for the Christian, there is this distinction between the moral standard and all others, the fact that there is a revelation of God's will as to morals, while none has been given us explicitly as to the beautiful, and the like. But we must nevertheless form our own standard even with this transcendent help: we must translate God's word into terms of our own consciousness by living it, or we shall

have no experimental knowledge. No one can be an authority, or aid in building up a standard, without experimental knowledge! Hearsay is no evidence; and mere theoretical knowledge is only hearsay. What we live of God's revelation is all we believe of it. Mankind's objective conscience is not the food from heaven set before it, but only that which it has eaten, digested, assimilated!

There are indeed consequences which flow from this distinction, but they are such as strengthen the importance of recognizing the reality of the objective conscience and the obligations which rest as consequences upon us. The very fact of this revelation as to its nature implies that it has an importance in our well-being far beyond any other element in it. We have been left to ourselves to discover and apply the properties of matter, the elements of beauty, the principles of economics, and the like. We have been aided in this one respect because it is transcendent. Whether we seek an aesthetic culture or not, may be considered a matter of indifferent choice, but we cannot so regard any neglect in the matter of moral culture: a man must be morally cultured. My neighbor may have poor taste and be guilty of bad logic, and yet be a very good sort of neighbor. But if he is deficient in morals he is not a good neighbor: he becomes dangerous to the community and subjects me more or less seriously to loss, injury, discomfort.

Because of this every community has its laws, its formulation of such a part of its moral consciousness as expresses that which a man must do or forbear from doing in order that the community may endure. The growth of these common laws demonstrates the existence and perfecting of the objective conscience. How they differ in communities of undeveloped conscience from those of Christian lands! How markedly the rights of persons increase with a clearer understanding of the dignity and worth of human nature as seen prefigured in Christ Jesus, the objective man! How sharply subjectivism is restrained as its vicious consequences are realized more fully. No individual is left to himself to develop himself or his offspring just as he pleases! Not even the plea that it is his religion, or even his way of re-

garding the religion of the Bible, is accepted if it is so palpably erroneous as to nullify the second table of the Law. Opinions he may hold, matters between his God and himself are left to be settled thus, but in dealings and relations with his fellow-men he must conform to the objective conscience or suffer the penalty their self-defence demands, since this same conscience insists upon such self-defence.

Again, just as a science is completed by a philosophy, so a jurisprudence rests upon a theology and a confession of faith. These are not mere abstractions, ingenious speculations; they stand in living relation to our concrete living. They are constitutions, as it were, the principles upon which laws are based and because of which conduct must be regulated. They are summaries of our belief as to that which is revealed both as to that upon which all are agreed and as to those differences of understanding which depend upon causes far reaching in their causes and their effects. Those who differ thus cannot enter more intimately and intelligently into common worship profitably and habitually: only those who believe sluggishly and indifferently, or with whom worship is a mere emotion, can fail to realize this inability. And as long as public teaching as to the intent and import of God's word is an adjunct of common worship, a distinct confession must mean a separate worship, if it is to be in spirit and in truth.

Having established the fact of the objective conscience, it is comparatively easy to indicate the obligation thus laid upon us, and the essentials in training and education to be inferred from it. First, and not the least in importance, is the cultivation of a proper sensitiveness to the moral relation of our thoughts, words and deeds. Whilst we cannot be unmoral in what we are and do, and are held accountable even for "idle words," undoubtedly very much, far too much, of the life of far too many is lived without any realization of any such relation in it. To express this sort of living the word "unmoral" has been coined, to distinguish from acts knowingly and consciously done in defiance of morality, such acts being strictly denominated "immoral."

This statement is easily verified! Take your own case! Use your powers of observation! The relation of economic commodity is sharply and constantly realized! The question, Will it pay me? is put over and over again every day. So too the relation between an act and the sensuous pain or pleasure of it, determines a hundred cases daily. Some are quick to see the professional relations, such as the literary quality, the grammatical accuracy, the aesthetic harmonies, according to their respective callings. Others are jealous and suspicious as to political or ecclesiastical bearings, and ready to scent offence where none is intended. But in the whole world of men and women how hard it is to call attention or secure reflection upon the moral relation of anything which is not most palpable and patent.

Training must begin early and be continuous to result in such a "tender conscience," such a "godly principle within" which will challenge each act of the will before it allows it to take place. Schooling must have as much stress laid upon this part of an education as upon the intellectual and the physical sides of it. Our youth must be made to think of the right and wrong of things as well as upon their effects on the body, on wealth-producing power, on social standing, and the like. Advantage must be taken of the well known working of the law of association. Constant repetition must reinforce and multiply associations until the training results at least in this, that the habit of considering the right or wrong of actions is as well grounded as the habit of using the correct grammatical forms, the right pronunciation of words, the proper letters in spelling. The importance of conscientiousness justifies a demand that it be developed at least as much, and with as fine a pedagogic treatment, as intellectuality or animalism.

The second aspect of the case is the decision of reason as to what is right, which is not attained simply because we may desire to do the right. All thoughtful persons have realized again and again the difficulty of reaching a decision in certain instances. It is only your emotional, gushing nature, your wildly enthusiastic "reformer," your fanatical religionist, who has no difficulties upon this point! "Cutting the Gordian knot" is not

untying it! The problem is not to separate the yoke from the pole of the chariot by destroying some part of the harness! Alexander did not conquer the world, any more than a whirlwind cultivates a field!

We have treatises on ethics consequently, and articles arguing as to the proper decisions in mooted questions, and differences of view among the very best and noblest of men. Just so we have these disputed points in all the analogous arts and sciences, in theology and philosophy. But also just so the body of agreement, the solid ground, is vastly greater than this uncertain area. To make sure of a right product there must be study and information, consultation of authority, respect for authority, appreciation of the fact that there is an objective conscience and that its contents are attainable, to be had by searching the words and deeds of the greatly good and the godly great. Properly written biographies, presenting ethics in concrete forms, are most helpful for the young in giving just such information.

What shall we say of those who for the sake of brilliancy, of originality, of becoming popular by their outrageousness, "medicate" a work of fiction with false statement, disingenuous chicanery, bad morals and illogical conclusions? They poison the community to gratify a selfish thirst for fame, or a greedy lust for wealth! Few professions are more responsible than those of author and publisher; and yet how often both are abused, how often neither seems to realize the moral responsibility bound up in the dissemination of that which is false or immoral or both.

Public education is an offender also in this direction. What shall we think of such a teaching of physiology and psychology as leaves the high school or academy lad persuaded that the brain is the soul, that diet and environment are character, and that right and wrong mean simply the effects of food and drink upon the tissues? Yet there is such education; and there are such text books; and there are those teaching them whose own sensitiveness and judgment are insufficient to enable them to know what they are doing.

Those who reduce religion to a mere emotion and attempt to

propagate it by a tidal wave, are not without responsibility as to this. Nor are those guiltless who have reduced the sermon, from the dignity of a charge by a judge learned in the law to a jury competent to decide as to the facts, into a recreational lecture to an "audience." However heartfelt or hearty worship is, teaching is still "profitable," the proper preaching of the word. Where that fails, there the reflective temperament will fail, and blind impulse will sway and impel without guiding and without attainment. A man who is unwilling to take the proper pains to know what is right, cannot lay just claims to being conscientious because he does what he thinks spontaneously to be right. A man who disdains to inquire what holy and just men have settled upon as being right, who prefers his own hasty individualistic and subjective opinion to the weight of such authority, has prejudices rather than a conscience. He is the sort of man quite likely to insist that "they done it" is better English than "they did it," or that one form is just as good as the other and that it is a mark of illiberality and narrow mindedness to affirm positively that one form is right and the other wrong.

But what then becomes of the "right of private judgment?" Let us put that question into the form of the *duty* of private judgment, and then discuss it! We must obey the dictates of our own conscience, in any final analysis. Of course we must! To obey mechanically the conscience of another man is not a conscientious act at all on our part! But does not this very thing declare how responsible we are, not only to our own conscience, but for it much more? Shall our life debauch our moral sense, and then the grossness of that sense excuse our immorality? That were the same as deliberately or recklessly drugging ourselves to excite us to kill one whom we should not dare to murder otherwise!

The remedy for the abuse of private judgment is not to be sought by forbidding it, but by educating it. It is constitutional with man to judge, and to judge as to morals or doctrine: you cannot prevent him from thinking by forbidding it. Rome begot, nursed, bred up the very men herself whom she calls heretics. It was as much the fault of her system of repression as

the inevitable of individuality. After all, some one must judge as an authority for others; and who is to vouch for that "private judgment!" It is notorious that the secure unquestioned possession of a right always tends to make men careless of their duty in the exercise of it. Authority needs challenges or it grows lazy, selfish, pleads the great right that will follow for the little wrong done to accomplish it, and lands in the sophism that the end justifies the means.

Toleration of those differing with us is a very different matter from that indolence or inertness which proclaims that "there is no difference," that "we are all one." Toleration, mutual respect, appreciation of causes which have made to differ, all imply that there is a difference, often a very serious difference. We gain nothing by trying to shut our eyes to that! We lose in sensitiveness of conscience by making the effort. For ourselves we must come to a decision and know what is right in our own conscience. If others whose lives show equal regard for right come to some different conclusion, we can surely respect while we dare not imitate, and exercise charity where we cannot co-operate.

There remains yet one point to be considered. In order that action may ensue not only must there be knowledge but feeling also. There must be an adequate and operative motive or the will does not command the hand to work or the foot to walk. What is this motive? We fail to find it anywhere for the mass of men outside of the motive of love, the love wherewith God has loved us, the love wherewith he entreats his erring children to return to him, loving as they are loved. There is no stronger motive, none which assimilates as love does. Philosophy may maintain an unstable equilibrium of conscientiousness for a few, but religion alone builds upon sure foundations. The more distinctly religion brings into our consciousness the love of God, the more definitely it sets his holiness before us, not driving us from him in awe of a dreadful majesty but drawing us to him in the desire of assimilation, the more surely shall we seek to know and to do his will; and thus define and obey the objective conscience.

ARTICLE VII.

THE PILLAR OF THE TRUTH,

EXTRACTED FROM THE "DREI BUECHER VON DER KIRCHE" OF PASTOR
WILHELM LÖHE,

BY EDWARD T. HORN, D. D.

1. *The Church.*

I.

The most beautiful landscape, though it be depicted with a magical pencil, and be true to nature, will not satisfy us if there be no human figure in it. Sadness and dread seize a man, when he sees himself forsaken by his kind, even though it be merely in a picture. Sadder is he who looks upon regions in nature which are utterly destitute of humankind. The more beautiful the spot in which we do not find our kind, the more painful is its loneliness. It seems rather a desert than a paradise. The wide earth would be narrower than a prison to one alone and forsaken. From the very beginning man was so made that it was not good for him to be alone.

Alone, a man cannot be blessed. It would be intolerable to look down from the heights of God upon wonderful valleys and lands, without being able to awaken a like feeling in the breast of another by my exclamation of joy. How much less could I look upon eternal blessedness alone, unable to share it with a companion. I am less able to comprehend the promise of eternal life than Adam was to comprehend the threat of eternal death, though there was then nothing of the nature of death in him, while I already enjoy the firstfruits of life. Yet I will say it: Alone, I could not be happy!

David said, "Whom have I in heaven but Thee, and there is none upon earth whom I desire beside Thee." In the world, in the dark valley of the shadow of death, it seems enough to have God. Would it not be enough in heaven, to have God?

It is a rare happiness on earth to be so alone with Christ for an hour that all one's thoughts, all desires, all joys of the soul,

rest undisturbed in Him, and He, and He alone, is present. How many have never found one such hour! Self always dogs us; the distractions of the world never leave us; we cannot get out of ourselves; and so the joy of being alone with God, for which we pray, may always be an unattained goal. If now, after so many struggles to get free from the world, and one's own shadow and thoughts, a soul should gain the victory and through the bitter pains of death should enter into life, and He would appear "Whom not having seen we love; if Christ would hold him to His heart, and let him rejoice in Him forever, would anything be lacking to that one soul? Would he not be completely happy?

Alone with Christ, you cannot be happy. He and His eternal happiness are too much for one soul, that has not near it any of its kind. David says again: "My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God. When shall I come and appear before God?" But in the same Psalm (42) he testifies: "I had gone with the multitude, I went with them to the house of God, with the voice of joy and praise, with a multitude that kept holyday." Here we can see that he did not wish for a lonely happiness, but that he acknowledges a blessed fellowship with others, and for this he longs.

Even though one did wish to be forever alone with God, his wish could not be fulfilled. As the Lord did not make earth for one man, neither did He make heaven for one. Whoever can wish for an eternal separation from all men, in him is not the love that is from God. Bad as we are, a longing after the Lord our God is born in all men. "For Him were we created, and our heart cannot rest, till it rests in Him." But a longing for fellowship with other men is born in us too; and it shows itself most of all when we have found the Lord. Conversion to the Lord makes the selfish social.

There are many fellowships on earth, but only one can satisfy; for every other fellowship is only a misunderstood prophecy and a more or less perfect shadow of that one fellowship intended by God and by Him destined to be perpetual. This one fellowship is *the Church of God, the communion of saints*. The Church is the eternal community and fellowship of elect souls with each

other and with God. In the Church is not only our happiness, but God's praise, God's glory. Blessed is he, who is one of the millions, each of whom has Christ, and with Him heaven and earth!

2.

It is a thought full of joy, a homelike thought, that in my pilgrimage through this dark valley, I am not alone. God witnesses that I go up to the House of God "with a multitude that keep holyday." And my eyes witness to the truth of that which I know out of the mouth of God. I see around me many men, whom I have good reason to consider children of God.

I am heartily glad for this; but, alas, death takes many a soul dear to me. As lights go out, one after another of the galaxy of my friends departs, and seldom does another star come into those dark places.

But they have only disappeared from mine eyes, my brethren have been promoted to higher places in the kingdom of God. What I feel so deeply is only their blessed progress into fair eternity, the certainty that they are happier than I am.

The pilgrims and those at home—those who walk by faith and those who see the King in His beauty are One Fold; and that which divides them is a passing thing: a weary eye that cannot see; a staff that is breaking,—a body that is frailer than a staff.

We are come to Mount Zion (Heb. 12 : 12 ss.). Its summit is crowned by the heavenly Jerusalem. In it the Triumphant Church surrounds God and His Christ. And towards the Mount, up to its summit, to the city that is builded that the tribes of the Lord may go up to it, goes an inconceivable host of men still in the body. Some are already so near to the summit and the gates of the city that the dawn of eternity shines upon them; while others are still at the foot of the mountain, deep in the gloom of earth, and have no ray of eternity on their brows. Still, all of them belong to the city on the Mount. It is to the living the apostle cries, YE ARE COME TO MOUNT ZION! The goal of the pilgrim Church is THERE. Here she is hastening away; There is her resting-place.

When I was young, I refused many a friendship and fellowship, because it could not last, and I thirsted for a lasting fellowship. Now I know an eternal fellowship, which becomes closer with every day. From it death shall not divide me, but death shall only bring me to full enjoyment of it. To it everything helps me—and nothing hinders me, be it what it may.

3.

The Church which lasts forever, must exist in all ages. In all ages a holy assembly separates from the generations of the world, and is gathered into the indestructible Church of God. For the sake of this separation and this gathering, God bears with the world, and nothing more important, nothing more weighty with results, takes place in all the history of the world. Were it to cease, there would be no more use for the world.

The Church, sprung into life on Pentecost, on Golgotha, goes through all the ages like one stream—and will go on until on that great day it pours itself into the sea of eternal blessedness. And just as all the drops of one stream are of one sort, so all the children of the great stream called the Church, have been of one kind, and ever will be. I am a brother of the Fathers before me, and of the children that shall come. There is no difference between the first and last-born child of the Church, except the difference of *Time*, which passes away.

New and false in this matter were the same thing. But the Church is not new. Like a wonderful tree it spreads; out of one shoot always comes the stem of a new shoot. At different periods, different blooms of one flower—such are the various forms of the One True Church, in the course of time.

The Church will not die so long as the sun and the moon endure. The stream may be narrowed, it may be hidden from a careless eye under the mountains or hills, for a while; but it cannot be overcome. *God will establish it forever*, Ps. 48 : 8.

4.

In the Old Testament the Church was comprised within the narrow boundaries of the family of Abraham, of the people of Israel. Even up to the birth of our Lord, it was in a proper

sense a National Church. It was a mystery, hidden from the world (Col. 1 : 26) and kept secret (Rom. 16 ; 25, 26), that other peoples should become joint heirs with Israel in the promise of Christ through the Gospel (Eph. 3 : 4 ff.). The uncovering of this mystery is the theme of the *Acts of the Apostles*, and the history of the Church is the fulfilment of it. It was the uncovering of this mystery which St. John received, when he saw 144,000 out of Israel, "and a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds and people and tongues, standing before the Throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes and with palms in their hands, crying with a loud voice, Salvation unto Him which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." (Rev. 7 : 9, 10).

The Church of the New Testament is the One Fold of the One Shepherd brought together out of many a flock (John 10 : 16). It is the work of God in the last hour of the world.

The work of missions is the One Church of God in motion. Wherever our missions penetrate, there are cast down the bars which separate nation from nation; wherever they come, they bring near what was far off and widely apart; where they find room, they beget that oneness, which renders it possible for all men of all tongues of the earth to understand each other. The work of *missions* is the LIFE of the Catholic Church,—where it stops, blood and breath stagnate,—and the love that unites heaven and earth dies, where *it* dies. If it were possible to separate the work of missions and the Catholic Church, it would kill both.

This is the meaning of the word CATHOLIC. It denotes the glorious difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament Church. *This* has no limits, but extends as far as the clouds and the air itself. All peoples can and shall have their part in her, and she shall have her part in them.

Just as there can be times when the Church seems like a brooklet, which drips painfully through the briars, when the springs of the earth seem dry and the windows of heaven closed to it, when a scarcity of redeemed souls make even an Elias think himself forsaken; so there can be regions and lands, in

which the children of God seem sown very sparingly. But for the Church on earth there are no true statistics. Where there is but one member of it, *there is nevertheless the Universal Church.*

Not always many, not always many or even some in every place, but always and in all places *all the children of God* belong to the great kingdom of the Lord. The little flocks of all lands and times make up the innumerable throng of the Revelation, the truly Catholic Church of heaven and of Eternity.

5.

The Church is One,—eternally One, One at all times, in all places.

The Church is *One in the truth.* That which makes of all her children one congregation, is the Truth. That Truth is God's Word, for the King of Truth says, "Thy word is truth," (John 17 : 17). The Truth which out of all the believers of all ages and lands makes One Church, is the word of the apostles, for the King of Truth says to the apostles, "Whosoever heareth you, heareth me; and whosoever despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me," Luke 10 : 16.

In the first age, when the oneness of the Church shone forth brighter than at any time since, and was remarked by all the heathen, no "œcumenical bishop," no temporal overshepherd, held her together, no living man was her centre; nor was it the universal dominion of one form of government, which produced the Church's unity; but the common truth of the apostles, known by all and acknowledged by all, made out of the most diverse men the one universal Church of God on earth. As long as the apostles lived, their spoken word was the point of unity to the Church; and after they had fallen asleep, it was their written word. From the first Pentecost the Church has been born of the word of the apostles, through the word of the apostles she has been made great, by it she has been called, enlightened, sanctified and preserved. Wisdom, understanding, discipline, fullness and satisfaction, knowledge which envelops the world like the dawn, and prophecy which abideth forever,

all, all that she has, the Church has drawn from the living spring of the apostolic word. She therefore calls herself the Apostolic Church.

What would it help if the Church had been founded by the apostles, but no longer kept their word? If she has departed from the apostles' word, her name is no more than a memorial of her lost Paradise.

It is a miracle above all other miracles that the word of the apostles has abode in the world, living, creative, and mighty,—and that wherever it has appeared the Church has gathered around it, so that it has remained the sun from which proceeded all the light and warmth in the world. The Church will be united forever through the word of the apostles, and this word, subject to no one, will be the source of one, universal, everlasting Church, to the end of days.

This is the best of all the Church's names: She is APOSTOLIC. All names become meaningless, when the Church no longer can be called apostolic. She is the candlestick; and the Word is the light.

6.

But can every man understand the Word? What would be the use of an obscure word, a spring of living water no one can get at? If the Scriptures cannot be the point of union for the Church, then is there none, for every other without the support of the Scriptures is, but vanity.

Did any one ever write a letter in order *not* to convey his meaning? Did the Lord the Holy Ghost write by Paul to the Romans and the Corinthians letters which could not be understood? to amaze poor people, and worry and frighten them?

True, without exposition a good part of the Old Testament is obscure. But the New Testament is the explanation of the Old. The New Testament is clear without the Old, but so much clearer if read with it. Peter called the Old Testament "a light shining in a dark place;" and what shall we call the New, which drives every shadow out of the Old. If that is dawn, this is day!

Does some one say, The translations of the Scriptures do not agree? No one dare say, they are false. If one alleges obscure

passages,—they are few, and unimportant, and do not darken the general sense of the Bible. The obscure passages must agree with those that are clear, because God is the author of both. No doctrine is taught in the dark passages alone; but may be known from those that are clear. Hold fast to the passages which are clear to you, and they never will deceive you. The Lord said, "Search the Scriptures." He considered them no cloudland, but a vein of eternal truth. He added, "For they testify of me;" and so we seek and can find in them witness to Him. They can make us wise unto salvation. And they are "useful for doctrine."

The Scriptures are like the starry sky. Whoever lifts his eye from the darkness of earth, sees those great stars of the first magnitude and the belt of light girdling the heavens. As they grow accustomed to the light, his eyes discern more and more stars. At length the very blue above seems interwoven with light. So the reader of Holy Scripture first meets those splendid mighty sayings, whose sense is so evident that they cannot be perverted or denied. As, strengthened by the first light, he reads on, passages which are bright and clear increase. At length he no longer sees only a milky way of bright truth in the heaven of the Bible, but a clear and conscious recognition of perfect harmony takes possession of him and exalts him.

The Scriptures always have demonstrated themselves. From the beginning there have been thousands and thousands, who through reading the Scriptures have come to one faith, viz., the original faith of the Church. Whether you look at the light of the first centuries or a later time, upon that of the Waldenses or of the Reformation, or of Spener, or of the latest awakening,—whether you accompany the Bible to Italy, or to Spain, or to the Tyrol, you will find that its clearness has produced the same one light of churchly knowledge in the souls of men.

The obscurities which are charged against the Scriptures, are in the heart and eye of man.

7.

It has been said that the Church is older than the apostolic Scriptures of the New Testament; that they received their au-

thority from her; and that therefore she is above them. It is true that the Church has borne witness to the writings of the apostles. But the divine origin of the Scriptures of the New Testament is self-evident, and distinguishes them unmistakably from all other writings in the world. How beautiful, for instance, is the *Epistle of Barnabas*, who is called by the Scriptures an apostle. Why should we not believe that Barnabas wrote it, for there is no reason to ascribe it to a later period than the apostolic age. Yet it has almost disappeared in the course of time. In the collection of the Canon of the New Testament, the Church was controlled by the *divine authority of the Scriptures*, and in her testimony she only gave back the impression which the Word of God and of men made on her. The Canon is defined by God's meaning and will, and by the character of the writings whose source is in Him. High as we may hold the service of the Church in handing down to her children and bringing to the world the truth which regenerates, nevertheless the witness of God and the truth is greater than the Church, which was born and is born of the Word.

The first Christian congregation was gathered by the spoken Word of an apostle. It is the same Word that was spoken on Pentecost and is heard to-day. Just as little as the faith of the first three thousand gave to Peter's first sermon its apostolic authority, just so little does the faith of the first three centuries give authority to the written Word of the apostles.

The centre of the Church—the Apostolic Word—never was more clearly seen than when the apostles lived and taught and wrote in the Church.

From the beginning it has pleased the Lord to spread abroad his truth through men, to increase his Church by means of the Church, to make it not only the assembly of believers, but also to make it a place of assembly for those who ought to believe and will believe. But that by which she saves others, saves her too.

8.

The Holy Scriptures describe the whole sphere of saving truth. There is no lack in them, which must be supplied by "Tradition."

No doubt the apostles said more than they wrote. The pupils of the apostles could throw light on dark places by their recollection of the apostles' oral instruction. Against doubt, this recollection would strengthen the weak. But the Church of later time is not poor because without this. We have all we need, and more too, in the clear written word of the apostles. The Spirit of prophecy is not far from His Church, and in the discipline of these eighteen hundred years He has granted her a sure instinct to recognize, accept, and apply what is necessary in every time.

There have been in the Church venerable traditions which contradicted each other. No writing of the Fathers is extant containing the traditions of the apostles. No one has collected their sayings, proved their origin and given them to us. It is ridiculous to say that any man is the depository of all the wisdom of the apostles, that his mouth pours forth infallible sayings as soon as a question touches his holy breast. How unfortunate are some of the interpretations of Scripture found in published letters of Roman bishops. How often have they been silent, when they should have spoken if they were in possession of divine truth. There are cases in which any simple man could interpret the Scriptures better than those have done, whose decree was trusted by millions. Just as foolish is it to believe that the apostolic tradition is enshrined in the decisions of *Popes and Councils*. The mistakes of Popes and Councils are historical.

To interpret Scripture by tradition is to appeal from light to darkness. In their connection, and in all particulars, the Scriptures are much clearer than the fathers are. From Moses to John they are one consistent Word of God. Every one can reach the "consensus" of prophets and apostles, of God and of His servants, in his English Bible; but who shall be able to find the consensus of the fathers? The definite written word resists perversion as the breath of the lips does not. So the pure breath from apostolic lips came to naught; but their word abides. All true readers and prayers witness that the Scriptures need no

tradition to interpret them. The Church lives by the Word, as once she lived *with* the Word.

9.

Has God called all men from darkness to light, from the power of Satan to himself?

Some say, Out of the great mass of sinful humanity God has separated a certain number for eternal life. These He has called and enlightened. But God wills that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. Christ atoned for the sins of the whole world. So is it necessary that "repentance and remission of sins be preached in His name to all nations." No man should be lost for the sin he has done against the Law, for that has been answered; no one should die for the natural resistance to God's Word which is present in every heart, for the power of the Holy Ghost overcomes it through the Word in all who without wickedness hear it. A man shall be lost only through stubborn wicked resistance to the calling Word. Therefore the Word of God must come to all.

10.

In some way the invitation goes to every man to turn from the world and join the Congregation called out of the world. Those who heed it, and outwardly turn from the world, and in the sight of all confess Christ and his Church, bear the honorable name of *the Called*. And those who not outwardly alone and before the eyes of men, but inwardly and according to the judgment of the Lord Himself have separated from the world and joined His Church, and therefore in the end will be acknowledged by the Lord as His own, are *the chosen*. "Many are called, but few are chosen." All the chosen have been called. Until the day of eternity it will not be open, who in truth are the chosen.

Exactly the same thing the Lord meant in the distinction between the *called* and the *chosen*, we mean when we distinguish between the visible and the invisible Church. The host of the called is visible; it steps forth from the rest of humanity. Before the eyes of all it holds God's Word and Sacraments, and in

the ears of all it confesses Christ and His Church. The invisible Church embraces those who, having been called, let themselves be enlightened, converted, justified, sanctified and perfected through the Word of the living God. No man can certainly know which of his brethren confesses Christ, is enlightened, converted and justified, and will be preserved until death and perfected in death. All who belong to the invisible Church, belong to the visible: they utter the divinely-given thought of their hearts in word and deed. Therefore the same persons belong to the visible and the invisible Church; the visible and the invisible Church are one.

II. *The Churches.*

I.

Since the visible Church is the assembly of the called, it exists wherever the call of God sounds.

Philip Nicolai, the author of the famous hymn, "O Morning Star, how fair and bright," and at the same time one of the most dreaded champions of the Evangelical Church, in his book on *The Kingdom of God*, outlines the extension of Christianity over the whole earth. He leads the reader from the high North into all lands. Greenland, Iceland, Lapland, the Orcades, the Russian countries and those subject to the Turk, Arabia, Persia, India, China, Africa, America, are explored. The condition of Christianity in every country is examined, and the missions of Rome and the Jesuits are claimed. All this he does with such fairness and so unconcealed a joy in all that is good, that it is hard to see how the rigid Lutheran can be so without sting or envy, so mild towards those whom he elsewhere treats as foes. At the end of the first part of his book he answers the question. He praises God that the name of Christ is known everywhere. Often the good seed is mixed and sown with bad; nevertheless, the good seed grows up too, and even among Roman and Jesuit missions the desire to save souls is uppermost, and to that end they often preach so near the truth and observe so evangelical a plan, that at home they would be called heretics. "Balaam and Judas," he says, "were able to teach others, and to show them the way which they themselves forsook. Christ

commanded to follow the teaching of those who sat in Moses' seat, though they themselves despised the word of God. The apostle Paul says some preach Christ of strife, and not purely, some even out of deliberate hatred and envy of Paul, yet he adds that he rejoices and will rejoice if only Christ be preached. And the Son of God admits that false prophets can prophesy in Christ's name, cast out devils and do many wonderful works."

In the midst of the tumult of human inventions there are bits of truth, which can light simple souls to eternal life. Everywhere is Baptism, through which many thousands of children dying in youth become heirs of eternal life. Everywhere are the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Psalter, and many another fragment of Holy Scripture. And besides, the ears of the hearers often are purer than their teachers' lips. So it is possible to be saved in the communion of most of the churches. No spot of earth need be hopeless, that harbors any one of the Christian communions.

In this sense the question, *whether heretics belong to the Church*, was answered by John Gerhard. He holds it even of obstinate heretics. Even they retain something of the Church, viz. Baptism and some uncorrupted fragment of Holy Scripture. Conversions, among them are to be ascribed not to the leaven of their opinions, but to the Word itself, and to Baptism, which is effectual if its form agrees with the institution of Christ, and the error affect not the substance of the sacrament. Therefore St. Augustine holds that even after their separation heretics belong to the Church, in virtue of the sacraments which they administer rightly.

If salvation depends on comprehending the truth in its whole compass, if it is not possible to be saved with a slight knowledge and through bits of truth, very few will be saved anywhere.

Suppose that you were a pastor, called to the sickbed of a man who never in his life had minded God's Word, but now earnestly wished to be saved. Would you begin to unfold in his ears the whole system of Christian doctrine? Would you insist that he must know and understand it all? You would not have time, and the sick man would have neither time nor

strength. With Nicolaus Hunnius (in his *Epitome Credendorum*) you would hold fast the principles, "The word from which faith springs forth immediately, is the doctrine of the universal grace of God and the universal grace of the Lord Jesus Christ;" and therefore you would preach repentance and the Gospel. And if you succeeded in bringing the sick man to acknowledge his sin and long for the salvation of God in Christ,—I will not say, to trust in the merit of Christ,—and he were to die in that condition, you would fold your hands and believe him saved. What saved him, then? A little drop of truth, a little repentance, a little flight to Him who is the source of the drop and a fullness for all thirsty souls.

So in the Church to which you belong, many are saved through fragments of the truth. For even the most complete knowledge on earth is but in part.

Let us thank God that it is the Chief Parts of the Truth which remain in those communions in the Church, which yet are not incorrupt; the Law, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, Baptism, Absolution, the Holy Supper, many a noble bit of Holy Scripture, are to be found here and there, and with them the possibility of attaining to repentance and saving faith. In the history of the nations there are examples and proofs enough, and on the last day there will be enough, that in other communions than our own it is possible to find the way of life.

2.

The Visible Church, spread over the whole earth, is divided into many "particular" churches, each having its own distinctive name. Though they may agree in the chief doctrines, and in most of them Holy Baptism may be rightly administered, we may not conclude that it makes no difference to which of them we belong. While salvation may be built on parts of the truth, shining amid darkness and falsehood,—tell me, is the human heart more open to truth than to falsehood? What enters it easier, under the guise of religion, than a notion which does not vex or stay "the old man" in us, but on the other hand flatters and cher-

ishes it? A church ought to have a great deal more of truth than of error and falsehood; for error and falsehood find, in the natural corruption of the human heart, a confederate. If many falsehoods and much error have the upper hand in a particular church, it is probable that in it we might be lost. Even under the complete truth many a one has so lived that only through grace ministered by the pastor to him on his dying bed he was saved. Only by the strength of God is a man saved with the pure doctrine. How difficult must it be where error is intermixed! There is no greater folly, nor any harder to answer for, than that which trifles with eternal life.

If the differences between churches consisted merely in liturgical forms, vestments and the like, we might let every one live as he liked. But they *teach* differently. It is impossible that one Word of God should at the same time have two contradictory meanings. He who has the false meaning, is in greater danger than he who plays with fire. False teaching begets false principles, and they a false life, and that is sin; and sin is a fire which only crazy people can carry in their bosoms without thinking it will burn them.

For slight differences the churches would not have separated from each other. There are no trifles in religion. There are sects distinguished by trifles. But we speak of the great particular churches, the Roman, the Eastern, the Reformed, the Lutheran, &c. The beliefs for which they contend are worth fighting for. To wish to disregard them, is unreason, or indolence, or of utter darkness.

Either none of these have the complete truth, or but one has it. To say that none have it, is to say that in the whole course of history God has gathered not one pure Church. The Church had the truth in the time of the Apostles. Who will deny that the first centuries had it too? Would the Lord have been so good to that early time, yet left us of the latter days in mist and gloom? Why should there have been a pure Church once, but never again? Has man become worse, have the Scriptures become more obscure, has the Holy Ghost become weaker? It is easy to admit that each of the churches has its

treasure, but is there not one whose pre-eminence is its acknowledgment of the whole truth?

Apply the Touchstone, and the miserable delusion that the whole truth is nowhere to be found, will vanish.

3.

The Church is distinguished from all other associations on earth by the possession of the pure Word and Sacraments. The churches are distinguished from each other by their explanations of the Word and their peculiar administration of the Sacraments. As the Church ceases to be the Church when it no longer has the Word and Sacraments; so a Church ceases to be what it was when it loses its own explanation of the Word and its own use of the Sacraments. Therefore the distinctive mark of a church is its confession or creed. That confession must be derived from the Scriptures, if it is to have any value.

What, then, is the distinctive mark of the Church which has the whole of the truth? *The scripturalness of her confession or creed.*

Therefore compare the Confession of the Church to which you belong with the Word of God. If it be confirmed, your work is done, for no confession can do more than agree with the clear Word of God. If your Confession agrees with it, while you remain faithful to it your soul is in no danger. This will bring you great peace.

The Scriptures are clear; in matters of faith they do not require the explorations of the learned; their light suits every eye. And when they do not seem clear, they answer a question clearly. Just as when you strike flint and steel they give forth the spark, so compare what the Bible says with what men say on the same subject, and you will see what a difference there is between men's word and God's word. The spirit of man is not quick enough to grasp a truth without thinking of its opposite. It is deliberate foolishness to refuse to consider the opposite of a doctrine. The Church is in the world, and is in opposition to the world. To compare an opinion or doctrine of men with the appropriate passages of Holy Scripture, is to ask a question of

God; and He will answer it. One can learn what the Scriptures say, by comparing one point with another. Through comparison we learn to distinguish.

But what, if on comparing and distinguishing a man finds that the Confession of his own Church is not justified? He must use further effort to find the Truth and the Church of the Truth. And even after the right Church and the Truth have been found, let other confessions be tried by the touchstone of God's Word, for the sake of the joy that will be felt in possessing it, and that we may be rendered steadfast and happy in the Word of God.

5.

If our Church have the pure Word and pure Sacraments in a pure confession, then she evidently has the highest treasures of the Church unperturbed. Then she has God's living fulness and the source out of which she may cure all her imperfections and may derive all the excellences of which other particular churches may justly boast. What were it to possess every other advantage, and lack the greatest treasures? Every ray of light that rests on any church, proceeds from the heart of our perfect Truth. Nor can the glow of human words and thoughts dazzle us; in possession of these treasures, one can easily forego things of less value until it is possible to get them without loss.

Here is the Holy of Holies of the house of God. If we say, "The Lord send thee help from the sanctuary, and strengthen thee out of Zion," the sanctuary and Zion are with the Church of the pure confession, in whose Word and Sacraments the Lord dwells more gloriously than in the Temple of the Old Testament. Hence proceeds salvation, for here is disclosed, not partially but completely, the clear truth of the Gospel. Whatever truths other communions possess, are here united in the Truth. The truth, kept in the fire of the centuries, the truth that overcometh the world, is here! Here it is confessed; here is protest against every perversion of it; here not a syllable of it is yielded. Let us rejoice in what we have, be a blessing to all other churches, refuse their errors, take pleasure in their truths,—fight against

their wrongdoing, and feel at one with them in all they do, that is right.

6.

But Rome says, "Where was Lutheranism before Luther?" If a church is no older than her confession, then is Rome younger than Protestantism, for only in the year after Luther's death did the Council of Trent begin, in which the confession of the Roman Church was agreed upon, and only after the close of the council was the Roman Catechism elaborated. But, of course, the question is, whether what we confess was confessed earlier than what Rome confesses.

We soon discover that the distinctive doctrines of Rome were not taught "everywhere, always and by all." It is possible to show where every one of them was first taught. What the earlier bishops of Rome taught, does not agree with what the Roman bishops of our day teach. In no diocese has one and the same doctrine been taught and confessed from the beginning. The present doctrine of Rome contradicts its earlier; and contradictions are not stages of development of the same truth.

It is true, that in the Fathers much can be found that is romanizing. But contradictions of it can be found too. It were a pity, therefore, if there were no other way of deciding the question.

If we divide "Antiquity" into two parts, which doctrine is the oldest, that which belonged to the year 40, or that which cannot be found till the year 400? Therefore let the Holy Scriptures, which preceded ecclesiastical antiquity, have the first word. The doctrine and confession which have the Holy Scriptures on their side, have antiquity on their side. Let no man be driven from the position that the Holy Scriptures are clear; and in the clear word of Holy Scripture we have a criterion by which infallibly to try both the contradictory teaching of the Fathers and the contradictory confessions of our own times. Whatever agrees with the Holy Scriptures,—that is oldest, and that is correct; and the church which has the Holy Scriptures on its side has the purest and the oldest antiquity on its side and in every age has had some, who as witnesses of the truth and

of the clearness of the divine Word, deserve more faith than the crowns and purple do, which contradict God's Word.

Now we are ready to answer the question, "Where was Lutheranism before Luther?" Forget the name and ask the meaning. It was at Jerusalem, and at Rome in the time of the apostles and in the first centuries after Christ. Where now error is taught without rebuke, the truth once was taught without rebuke; and when, as the apostles foretold, falsehood took the throne of truth, truth's first mighty protest sounded there where now no tongue speaks for the truth. And when truth was silenced in its old places, it wandered to other parts, and always had children and confessors. Though dark ages came, in which it was hard to find the truth in its beauty anywhere, or anywhere to hear the full harmonious chorus of its song, yet it never was impossible. And though the time of the Reformation was a time of complete uncovering of the sanctuary of the truth and was brighter than former times, it still is easier for us to show the hidden testimonies in the combined light of the Reformation and of the earliest times of the Church. Though we never may be able on earth to find all those who were confessors of the truth,—if the stake and massacres and the cries of the martyrs do not give us all the traces of the children of God,—yet there will be a day, in which we shall see how many the Lord had chosen for Himself in the worst eras and kept from the evil.

The children who died in their Baptismal Grace,—the simple who departed in the forgiveness of their sins,—the penitent, who died trusting Christ's blood and wounds,—all the blessed who before Luther stood before the Throne of the Lamb,—what confession, what church, did these own? That which rests on Peter's grave, or that which is built on Peter's confession? So we point to those who were children either in years or in spirit, and say, These were the Kingdom of Heaven before Luther! And we look up to Zion, and say, There was the Church! There they care not for earthly ornament, for the pomp of bishops and priests, but for the *Truth*, and the Truth is ours!

That church is oldest whose doctrine is oldest,—and that

lasts longest, whose doctrine lasts longest. That Church will outlast the world, which holds the Word in a pure Confession, the Word, of which is written, that it endureth forever. Its names and place may change; it may become big or little; it is neither maintained nor overthrown by earthly power; its progress is wonderful, sometimes on high, sometimes in the dust; but it will continue, it will outlast everything; for with it is the Way, the Truth and the Life.

7.

Our Lord called His Church "a little flock." That a Church has great numbers of adherents, therefore, is not a proof that it is the Church of Christ. The Christian Church does not embrace a moiety of the human race; and now that, after the lapse of eighteen hundred years, the Church has approved itself the highest and loveliest conception known to man, the world also enrolls itself among the confessors. Therefore we may as little be terrified to find another Church more numerous, as we may be confident on finding ourselves the stronger.

8.

The Unity of the Church is unity in the Truth, in confession, in doctrine.—The "unity" of the members of the Roman Church with their head, the Pope, is another thing. And it cannot be proved. Where was it in the beginning, for six hundred years or more? Where was it when there was no pope, or there were several at one time, or when the pope was declared a heretic by his own?

The "hierarchy," the episcopal or patriarchal government of the Church, has not divine right. We know an episcopate, founded on Holy Scripture, which is identical with the presbyterate, and we cannot see how there can be a Christian congregation without it. But where is there a syllable in the Bible to prove the divine right of diocesan episcopacy, of "the episcopal succession," or of the primacy of the pope? The Scriptures do not know this human invention at all. For venerable as the form of government by bishops is, and strong the claim which history urges for it, it deserves to be called only a human invention, when it asserts a divine right.

There is a unity—the unity of confession and doctrine,—a unity in faith. This our Lord and his apostles intended, and in it is the chief glory of the Church. But this is not found in the Church of Rome. There is “a succession,” but not of places and persons, but of doctrine. The doctrine does not die, and wherever it is, there is the true Church, the real bishops, and the real priests. Where it is not, every other succession is a grave of the prophets, full of dead men’s bones and all uncleanness. If we but have this succession of doctrine, there will be no want of power and of life to show before the eyes of men that *here is the Church*. Let us insist on this succession, and then nothing shall be lacking,—least of all right calling of teachers, ordination, prayer, blessing, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost to the holy Ministry.

The structure of the Church is a miracle of miracles. Its foundation seems as slight as the rainbow’s; for the dwellers on earth think only earthly foundations firm. But it is founded on the eternal Word. Let us look at the Word, and in the Word be One. If our church order and discipline be faulty, we may lament it; but if the Word and doctrine rule, we may hope all things. Order, discipline, liturgy may be faulty, yet thousands will be saved if we have the Word. And there will be no forgiveness of sins, no peace in life, no hope in death, no blessedness in heaven,—no Lord’s Prayer here, and no Hallelujah there—if we have not the Word. For it, we may give all else. It is the source of all good, and the death of all vanities.

“Lord, keep us steadfast in thy Word!”

9.

Over against the self-chosen works of Roman ascetics, Martin Luther pointed Christians each to his *calling*. He taught that all the deeds of a man in his calling were to be works of love, good works. That to which God did not call a man, was no good work. It was not enough that it was done in faith; it must also have God’s command. God’s commandments and our daily calling thus banished asceticism. The father in his home, the mother among her children, the laborers at work, the farmer in his field, the servant in kitchen and yard, were trans-

figured by this doctrine of *our calling* and of the blessing of the works of our calling. There is no longer a "common" in contrast with a "religious" life; but love finds exercise in common life. There is no distinction between Commandment and "Evangelical Counsel," between monk and man of the world, between priest and layman: there is one holiness for all believers. Each serves the Lord in his own place—and each place thus becomes an Altar of Praise to God, where His Name is glorified, His Love is shown! If we open our eyes, then, we will find saints enough among us, not clad in monkish habit, but hidden in the dress of daily life. God grant us many of *our Saints*, and let us see their glory on that day!

10.

The preservation of the Church under all the attacks of the devil and his hordes these 1800 years, her unbroken, fresh and youthful strength to-day, were miracle enough, if the voice of the Truth were not penetrating and mighty enough without it. And indeed, it were easy to be deceived by miracles. There are wonders, which seem like miracles, and therefore must be distinguished from them. Real miracles are done by God alone, either immediately or through his servants, (Ps. 72 : 18). But false prophets, the Antichrist, the Beast, can do wonderful things that seem like miracles (Matt. 24 : 24; 2 Thess. 2 : 9; Rev. 13 : 13). It is therefore necessary to *try* the miracles we may see, and to observe this rule: *True miracles can be done only in the service of the pure doctrine, and without the longknown pure doctrine of the clear Word of God, miracles prove nothing.* Deut. 13 : 1-5.

And so is it with *prophecies*. We do not deny that the spirit of prophecy still lives, and still is in the Church. But we hold that all prophecy must agree with the faith. A prophecy which does not confirm the true doctrine and is not in connection with it, is vain and worthless. (Deut. 13 : 1-5). One that rests on purely human grounds and does not proceed from the Holy Ghost, is a conjecture, not a prophecy; like that of Balaam (Num. 24), or that of Caiaphas (John 11 : 51), it is no warranty

of the man. Therefore prophecies as well as miracles must be tried by the received faith of the Church. (Rom. 12 : 7).

III. Our Church.

I.

In the age just preceding the Reformation so many novelties and abuses had come up in the Roman Church, that in all the countries of Europe the more prudent were filled with displeasure. Many attempts at reformation were made before Luther, as the Councils of Constance and Basel may testify. The miscarriage of these attempts only increased the longing for deliverance.

In the fulness of time the Lord sent deliverance. He had brought to pass a hitherto unknown revival of the study of the Greek and Hebrew tongues. This led men back to the sources of religion, to the Old and New Testaments. The less they had known of these, the more were men amazed at the contradiction they found between these sources of truth and the doctrine and Church of their time. The clearness of the divine Word could not have astonished more, than after a period of such deep sleep. And its contradiction of the doctrine and Church of the time was not only surprisingly clear ; it was transporting. Above all things the Reformers demanded *agreement with the Word of God*.

There were two ways of answering this. On one side, everything was regarded as a miserable remnant of popery which had not a word of the Holy Scriptures for it. With inexorable rigor everything was cast away, for which an express foundation in the Scriptures could not be found. On the other hand, in spite of equal earnestness in Reformation, everything was kept which had not Scripture *against* it, and which could be *retained* without danger to the pure doctrine. For instance, the Liturgy, the pictures in the churches, and their other ornaments, were treated differently, according as men followed the one or the other tendency.

The latter tendency acknowledged that the Church had not lived 1500 years since the Apostles' time in vain. The Apos-

tolie doctrine had unfolded in the course of history, and in the progress of the time the One Word had revealed an ever richer fulness. The history of the Church was regarded, and fellowship with antiquity. They aimed not to cut loose from preceding centuries, and to begin something new and independent; but on the other hand endeavored by means of the clew of Holy Scripture to continue the Apostolic Church and to cleanse it of novelties. Not that they wished to have everything just as it was in the time of the Apostles, but to make the historical development of the Church unblamable in the presence of the Apostles and Prophets. They acknowledged that the Holy Ghost rules in history; but nothing is His work which contradicts the clear Word. *Unity of Scripture and History, Communion with the Scriptures above all and with the pure Church of all ages and lands, true Catholicity* marked the latter tendency, the tendency of Luther. Compare his course with Carlstadt's; read the Symbolical Books; and you shall see this harmonious conception of Scripture and History, this conviction of a pure Church, that never has perished, this hatred of what is new, this regard for the old, this comparison of what is venerable with what was before it.

Therefore the German Reformers continually appealed to a universal, free, Christian Council. They hoped to persuade the whole world that they were trying to put away only novelties and abuses, and not the harmless usages of the past. In this sense they made their Confession at Augsburg in 1530. With the light of the divine Word in their hand, they moved through all centuries and lands, rejoiced in every pure, churchly, scriptural confession and life, recognized in such the witness of the same Spirit that controlled them, and never dreamed that any one could charge them with falling away from the One ancient Catholic Church without sinning against his own conscience. Yes, so firm was their conviction that they were the children of the Apostles and the Fathers, so tranquil their conscience resting in acknowledged Truth, that they saw in their opponent's insistence on the distinctive doctrines and abuses of Rome nothing but apostasy from the ancient doctrine. And when the

Council of Trent (1545-1563) solemnly adopted the new Romish doctrines and abuses, then the Fathers of our Church declared: Now first has that been made the property of the Roman Church which hitherto was only filth upon its face and feet; now has Rome apostatized; and now is it evident that the primitive and ancient Church, separated from Babylon and from Rome, is to be found in the fellowship of those they call *Lutherans*. In contrast with this fallen Church, the Lutherans call themselves Catholic and Apostolic.

And who dare blame them? The ancient pure Church of the West lives where the ancient pure doctrine of the ancient pure Church is preached. All things are ours, whether Christ, or Paul, or Peter, whether Linus or Anacletus or Clemens, whether Cyprian or Augustine. The cloud of witnesses of all past time has come over to us. With us is their knowledge, their wisdom, their peace, their joy, their strength, their patience—and blessed be God therefor!

2.

Is the reformation of the Church complete? It is complete in doctrine, but it is incomplete in the consequences of doctrine.

There were controversies between confessors of the pure doctrine, but, as in the controversies of the first Centuries, under the dust of the strife, a sweet fruitage of righteousness and peace was won.

There are indeed theologians at the present day who think that in the study of doctrine many victories are yet to be won. The Church is the bearer of a certain knowledge of God, a custodian of immortal truth. Her children can grow to manhood only through knowledge and appreciation of that which has been from the beginning.

But it were well to give to the pure, rich doctrine free course. There never has been a time in which men were fully conscious of its worth and earnestly considered how much could be accomplished by it for the world and for the Church. From the pure doctrine comes forth a correct judgment of everything that is earthly and passing. Let us not be too narrow in holding on to certain forms and outward things which have been since the

Reformation. With many an abuse a pious use was thrown away at that time. Let us set the light of the true doctrine on a candlestick, so that the nations may see and rejoice in this free city for all the unhappy, in her, who having freely received, freely gives, that which saves!

3.

It is the great calling of the true Church to teach the true point in which all the churches can unite, and continually to oppose to the contradictions of the churches that what all are seeking, rightly understood, is united in her doctrine. Far from seeking union by overlooking undeniable differences, far from attempting to force a union by human authority, the true Church prays without ceasing for the union of all souls in one pure doctrine, and hopes that all the sheep of the Good Shepherd may hear His voice in the preaching of the pure doctrine and may gather in one fold. But she knows her vocation too clearly, and is too conscious of her treasure, the pure confession and the pure doctrine, to encourage the expectation that she will ever modify her confession for the sake of union. She, the guardian of the pure doctrine, cannot give up any part of the truth she has learned, of the right measure of all the thoughts of God, of the panacea for the world, without unfaithfulness to God, who gave her this trust, and transgression of her calling.

The earliest confession did not answer all the questions which must be met. The questions of men must have a sufficient answer. The Church must possess complete truth, before she can realize God's loving thought in her heavenly calling. Therefore let no portion of truth be yielded that was won so bitterly! Let us not treat that lightly, which God entrusted to us, and will ask of us again!

The pure Church holds what she has. She is honest against every error. She says NO, a simple, quiet, earnest, firm, *No*, to everything that is not true. She is consistent in this testimony. But she says YES, a simple, tranquil, joyful *Yes*, to everything that is true, wherever she may find it. She confesses her unfaithfulness and sin against the blameless glorious confession

that she has to bear before all the world,—she confesses her own sin, and does not condone the sin of others. She yields not a tittle of the truth. This may offend those who are not of a pure heart; but if they begin to attack and condemn her for cleaving to the truth, she may remember the word, “I am for peace; but when I speak, they are for war.”

This true, patient, unterrified witness the Lord uses to bring the hearts of men to unity. It is indeed vain to hope that all will come to the narrow way; but still we may hope that God will increase His Church and make the truth victorious over falsehood.

4.

The torch of the pure truth is to be carried to all peoples. We pray the Lord to forgive us, that hitherto we have done so little for the heathen. The Lord can raise up among us hosts of evangelists, who can go into the ways of the heathen and testify to them the universal grace of God in Christ Jesus. And if the Lord increases us in the old lands of Christendom, and gives us new strength, the fire of one united love will show itself yet more mightily among the heathen. We pray the Lord to fill our hands with salvation for the heathen; and He will do it!

5.

The Lord gives His Holy Spirit only by means of His Word and Sacraments; therefore these are the Church's only means. She knows that in the work of his salvation a man can do no more than to lend his ear to the Truth of God, as he might lend his ear to any other word; and therefore, above all things she seeks to admonish, to urge, men to hear and to heed the Word of God. She knows that the spiritual man is not always able to hear and to consider the Word of God; and still less does she expect the child of this world to give much time to the hearing of it. She knows that a man is more likely to open the sanctuary of his heart to the Truth if it be given him sparingly, than if its voice is heard without ceasing. Therefore she gives to the people enough, but not too much, of her means. She is not abashed if some one says: “This pastor thinks it enough, if he

preach, catechise, administer the Sacraments, hear confession, and comfort the sick!" She knows that the most faithful pastor cannot do enough of this. She thinks but little of increasing the means of ministerial usefulness, but much of the right use of the Means enjoined in the Scriptures and acknowledged from the beginning. To many it is a novel wisdom, not to be ingenious, but rather to be master of the few noble means; but the Church has always understood this. With one word: *She does much, by a few means.*

To one who compares the advice which Baxter gives to a pastor, or Gottfried Arnold, with the pastoral-books of our fathers, at first it seems that the latter suggest too few methods, and that Baxter and Arnold had a higher notion of a pastor than, for instance, Balduin and others. But a man of experience sees otherwise. Enough and more than enough is done, if one has accomplished all that belongs to the performance of the old traditional duties of the Ministry. The poverty of our fathers is richer than the riches of their critics. By alternation of privacy and publicity, of silence and outspokenness, through faithful use of Word and Sacraments, through modesty and steadfastness, the Church reaches her ends.

She therefore cares little for modern and highly-praised means to further good work. She does not try to stimulate good works by the methods of business. She recognizes that works which depend upon the methods of modern societies easily suppress other works, disturb the harmony of the many gifts of the Spirit, and make men one-sided and intemperate. She does not adopt the shibboleth of human extravagance in works; but she encourages to the performance of all good, and exhorts every one to do according to his gift and in his place and calling that which is well-pleasing to God. She endeavors to unite *all* good works in her midst. The care of the poor, she recognizes to be the duty of the Church, as it was in the Apostles' age; the School is still the Church of the children, and her own kingdom, as in former days; the sick, the stranger, the orphan, still are her charge; she still cares for the maintenance of her ministers, and that the house of God be such as to serve its end. Her

bishops or pastors unite the congregations in all good; they give to every good work its measure according to the Word; they lead and feed the people. The Church as a whole, the congregations singly, *embrace all good works*,—and what is done is done *in unity of the flocks with their shepherds*. In obedience to the Word, without debate and rivalry, in holy tranquillity, all is mightily done for which the Lord gives ability and grace. So the Church has many activities, though the means by which she does all and encourages to all good, always are the same: the Word, the Sacrament, the holy office of the Ministry.

Few Means—many good works! That is the rule of the Church.

6.

Among the means which the Church uses for the salvation of soul, the Pulpit stands first. It is the means of calling those who stand at a distance, and of making those who have come at her call sure in their calling and election. It is not her aim to support the Word by human arts of speech; but the main thing is not to hinder its powerful operation, and not to force upon it a method which does not belong to it. The preacher preaches salvation in Christ Jesus, with the consciousness that not his work, but the noble contents of the Word itself must bring the souls of his hearers to God. Certainly the preacher believes and therefore speaks, but a faithful preacher does not aim to recommend the truth by *his* faith and experience, but rather to bring his people to say with the Samaritans: "Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." An upright preacher is a faithful witness of the Word, and the Word testifies to him; he and it appear as one. All his preaching is based on holy peace. Even when he rebukes and the zeal of God's house eats him up, it is not the anger of the restless world, but the wrath of the God of peace, which is awakened in him. He is nothing, and Christ in him is all.

In his confidence in the divine Word he despises all slavery to method. His method is simplicity, directed by the occasion

and the Word. He does not try to win friends to the Lord Jesus by human eloquence, excitement of feeling, and play upon the nerves. He does not aim at a disturbed awakening, but at a revolution produced by the thoughts of God. As the heavenly calling goes on to enlightenment, and each step of progress in the inner life depends on an increase of knowledge, so he seeks to make known the holy thoughts of the divine Word and to bring them to the recollection, consideration, acceptance, and inmost soul of his hearers. He does not condemn the affections, but stirs them by silently holding before them the heavenly light, and knows that its ray brings also warmth. His watchword is not "Awake," but those words of the Scriptures which tell of the gradual and silent growth of the divine seed. He is not impatient, but waits upon the Word. He waits, knowing that the choicest fruits do not ripen in a day; and he waits on *all* his sheep, for he knows that the Lord has His time, and sometimes hastens, but sometimes waits.

The preacher of the Church is therefore no friend of "New measures," but keeps to the old measures of patient fidelity to the Word and pure doctrine.

This spirit governs the selection of his text. He rejoices in the Gospels and Epistles for the Church Year which have come down to us from early times. He never is tired preaching on the Gospels. The people like them best, and to him they are fuller and richer the oftener he preaches on them. The longer he uses them the more does he learn the great art of a preacher, to lead his people to what they do not know through what they do know, and to show all the doctrines of the Church in the well-known text. He who changes his texts every year, is not a good preacher for the people, nor, we may say, for the Church. They more cheerfully receive fresh truth, if it comes as the freshly-recognized fullness of the old truth. The *Epistles* belong to the minor services of Sunday. The Epistles agree with the Gospels, the Apostles with Christ—in all is One Faith, One Order of Salvation, One Sanctification.

For weekday services Luther advised a continuous explanation.
VOL. XXVII. No. 1.

tion of the Bible. Yet no preacher can attempt a complete exposition of every word of it. It is not necessary to accurately expound every conjunction, preposition, noun and verb; but everywhere he selects the clear passages, through them to confirm what the people know and to show it in a new light. His prophecy always is according to the analogy of faith, and he always gives to the people what in the light of their Catechism and the Gospels they can understand. He aims not at explanation of obscurities so much as confirmation and preservation in that which is clear. This is the way of simplicity, profitable to all, possible to all, though it may not seem learned. A fair example of it is seen in Luther's explanation of the Bible in comparison with Calvin's. The latter seeks an accurate understanding of the language; the former endeavors to confirm the clear doctrine of the Scriptures. Calvin is accurate (as indeed it is well for a theologian to be), but Luther selects, writes as a pastor, is always girt about the loins and shod to fight for the Gospel of peace and the faith; *and this is good for the vacillating minds of the lay and the learned.*

7.

The Small Catechism of Luther is a confession of the Church, and of all the confessions the most familiar to the people, and the most congenial to them. It is the only Catechism in the world that a man *can pray*. Justus Jonas said of it, "Though it costs but six pfennigs, it is worth six thousand worlds."

Though thousands of explanations of the Catechism have been printed, so that there is a very deluge of them, Luther's own words are the ark upon the flood, which saves *some*, while the flood itself kills.

The Catechism should not be covered under explanation and addition, but is itself the *end* of instruction. In times when there was much more general knowledge of the faith than there is now, lectures on it were read in the Universities. Few are able to set forth the richness of its thought. It was composed for simple pastors. It is a measure which reaches to all, great and small.

It gives to the people a standard, by which to try everything, so that they may not be tossed about by every wind of doctrine, by the deceit of men and cunning craftiness. It establishes their hearts in the Word of God. The teacher in the Church rejoices to find in it a standard for his teaching, and for others a standard for their learning.

The Catechism was written not only for the Church and the School, but also for the HOME. House, School and Church are made one Church by means of the precious Catechism. It is so wretchedly learned and singsonged, and sounds so wooden and empty, because treated as if it were not practical wisdom for daily life, but only a child's task at school. It belongs to the lips of all, as a battlecry belongs to all who are united in one host. The father, the children, the household should use, pray, learn, prize it; and so it will become the cruse of the widow of Sarepta, that never fails.

It is divine in the text, human in its faithful questions. It is a battlecry, which, spoken from the depths of the soul, can overthrow the strongholds of Satan. Let it be quoted and praised, that it may help to establish the unity of the Church, that great and small, learned and unlearned, may have something in which they are at one, and in the tumult of the age may know that they are at one.

8.

We shall wait in vain for the strait and narrow way to become broad.

A pastor's care is for each one of his flock. The centre of it is in *personal Confession*, a custom of the Church, which now has fallen into disuse. We do not mean the auricular confession of the Papacy, but personal confession, private absolution. To this must be added an exercise of discipline. The Absolution is valuable, if there may be an excommunication also. Without education and discipline, there is no pastoral care. The mildness of a father is of use only when he is also severe at the proper time.

9.

The Church not only is taught; she prays. Not only do the members of the Church pray in their closets; they pray together in common worship. She says, she sings, her prayers. And the Lord dwells among her praises with His Sacraments. Her drawing nigh to him, and His drawing nigh to her,—the sacred forms of her approach and His coming,—this we call the Liturgy, the Service. These forms are free; very few of them have been commanded; but in spite of her freedom the Church from the beginning has declared her pleasure in certain forms. In the course of time a holy wealth of songs and prayers have been gathered. In holy childlike innocence, which only a childlike and innocent heart can rightly understand, the host of redeemed and sanctified children of God move about the Universal Father and the Lamb, and the Spirit of the Lord God conducts them. The heavenly joy which those who can take pleasure in it find, in their participation in the Liturgy, cannot be expressed; it affects others too; and the pure confession of the Truth is never so lovely and so inviting as when it is heard in adoration and praise.

This the Reformers knew. The traditional forms of worship were not put away, but cleansed from sin and stain. The Lutheran liturgies unite variety and simplicity. To these are to be added the glorious store of inimitable hymns, which for three hundred years have been sung to the glory and praise of God.

In days of humiliation the children of the Church in losing her faith lost also her prayers and song, the ornament and glory of her worship of God, and now it is no easy task to bring the older back to the old faith, and the young to the confession of their forefathers, and all together to the innocence and childlikeness that can rejoice before God in song and prayer. Habits must be formed; and that which seems unnatural must be made natural by use.

The Liturgy is a fruit of the inner life. But like a sweet fruit of a good tree it can be made a food, which will make men hunger for more.

Yet the Church remains what she is, even without the Lit-

urgy. She is a queen, even in beggar's rags. It is better to give up all else and hold only the pure Truth, than to maintain glorious services, which are without light or life, because they are without the pure doctrine. Yet the Church need not go in beggar's rags. The true faith speaks not in the sermon only, but it prays in the prayers, and is sung in the holy songs. The Liturgy strengthens the Church against her enemies. It is a two-edged sword for the wars of the Lord.

10.

The more steadfastly the Church recognizes herself, her firm foundation in the Doctrine of God's Word, her place among Confessions and in the world,—the greater blessing will attend her faithfulness. Our Church is not identical with the Church Invisible; among us are hypocrites enough, who shall be lost; nor are all the children of God on earth reckoned to her, for many in other confessions have enough for eternal life in fragments of her wealth. But she is purest, pure in doctrine and confession; and he who lets her word and confession live in him, without doubt is a child of God, an heir of heaven, a joint heir with Jesus Christ. The Lord is among us. Let us be one, brethren, and our oneness in the primitive Truth and our joy in the Lord will be our strength. Let us worthily stand for the holy Church, in the midst of the confessions, in love and earnestness. Let us recognize the duty of our Church in the work of Missions, and carry her light into all lands. Let us be one. Let us be one before our people. Let one Word and doctrine, one manner of teaching, one song of praise, be among us.

Our unity is in the Almighty Word of Almighty God. The world shall know that we are His disciples. For our Church has never lacked but one thing to be a blessing to all the world, and that is—Unity.

One God, One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism,
One Exodus, One Way, One Door!
Praise be to God, who helpeth us.

Amen.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE CHRIST OF ALL DAYS.

BY REV. EDWIN HEYL DELK.

Phillips Brooks was fond of declaring that what happened to Christ during his earthly career has been repeated in the after history of the Church. Other Herods have attempted, by violence or grave discussion, to murder the new born life, only to repeat the doom of the first Herod—"they are dead that sought the young child's life." Other men have gathered around Him, with their preconceptions and spiritual blindness, attempting to give Him directions and place in the social order. Men of later ages have followed Him because it was profitable and comfortable. Still He gathers about Him the care-worn and sin-cursed multitude. Later days felt the calm, cool touch of His healing hand. The Scribes of nearer centuries sought to entangle Him in His talk. The eighteenth century Sadducee, and the nineteenth century Pharisee, repeated the skeptical sneer and the selfish shibboleth. Later Pilates, upon the judicial bench, have compromised with crime and sought, with pitiable care, to wash His blood stains from their hands. Later high priests of some popular cult have sought to minimize His claims to divinity. The rabble ever since has hooted at Him, and bestial militarism has cast lots again for His seamless garment. Strong hands and bleeding hearts have borne Him, since the Arimathean Joseph, to the tomb, or sought to caress His risen body. Later souls have been set on fire and like human torches of sacrifice have moved east and west, south and north until, to-day, the darkest nook of Africa catches the glimmer of the approaching Sun of Righteousness.

It is small wonder then, if we find the mental history of His disciples repeated, in varied forms, during the centuries subsequent to apostolic times. Thanks to Beyschlag with his *New Testament Theology*, and Wendt in his *Teaching of Jesus*, we

have been taken back to the primal facts and earliest conceptions of Christianity. Under the leadership of these master critics, the whole New Testament drama is unfolded in intelligible sequence. That there was a *gradual* apprehension of the greatness of Jesus, by his first followers, no sane reader of the New Testament can doubt. Christ's initial manifesto, "The kingdom of God is at hand," at once provoked a conflicting group of opinions. First, as simple prophet He was attended by sympathetic pupils. Later, His marvelous power over sea and human life put him in a place apart from the progressive rabbi and brought hundreds to his ministry. Gradually the idea that the Galilean was the Messiah found lodgment in the expectant heart of His disciples. They became eager to declare the advent of the Messianic reign. Their materialistic conception of the Kingdom of Heaven was rebuked by Jesus. Later, the belief in His virgin-birth placed Him in a position apart and above all mortals. Gradually, the transcendent, spiritual nature of "The Christ" dawned upon them and, as He unfolded His final return to judge all nations of the earth, love expanded into adoration. Then came the shock of His crucifixion and death. Finally, His triumphant, assuring resurrection and flight to the bosom of God. Then St. John, ripe in years and in spiritual vision, realizes Jesus as the Eternal Word, as God incarnate, by whom, and in whom, all things exist. Thus was completed the cycle of their apprehension of Jesus. It was not the essential but the fragmentary, partial Christ which they at first, and for years, entertained and revered.

Now, what was enacted in the early history of our Lord and his disciples, has been, in some way, repeated by the after centuries. First, one phase of his character, then, another element of his being, later still, another quality of his person has been seized upon and presented as the all-important factor of his life. Although there has been a continuity in Christian thought concerning Christ, each age has thrown its peculiar light upon his abiding features, and the portrait presented has been brightened or darkened, etherealized, or humanized, according to the mental and social type of the theological epoch.

The winsome, shepherding feature of his nature received the first recognition by the persecuted worshipers in the Roman catacombs. Greek thought caught up the Hebrew delineation of the Synoptists and gave philosophic enlargement to their portrait of Jesus. The Pauline symbols of divine law were hardened by the Latin theologian into a dogmatic governmentalism of polity and faith. Later, the austere, vengeful quality of the "judge of all the earth" was pictured in mediæval fresco and mosaic. For years the figure of the real Jesus was obscured by the multitude of obtruding saints and the glorified virgin. Then, at the Reformation, a large part of the essential Jesus was recovered for the Church, but, later, orthodox rationalism could not keep its brush off the portrait, and its divine-human features were hardened into almost stony aloofness. The metaphysical, instead of the actual Christ was made the test of allegiance. Accuracy in defining his person, rather than largeness of personal correspondence was the test of orthodoxy. Under the dominion of this over emphasis of the intellectual apprehension of Christ, the Church labored for two hundred years. Within our own century, under the leadership of Maurice and Bushnell, there has been a re-birth of the idea of God's fatherhood. This point of view, new to English thought, has brought a rightful humanizing of the divinity of our Saviour and given his ethics and his person a new significance. The demand of our age is for fact, for personality, for personality at its finest ethical expression. It is the ethical Christ which commands the attention of the age. One of the most notable books of the day has as title—"The Christ of To-Day." Dr. Gordon, in that notable book, clearly recognizes that the Christ of to-day is the ethical Christ and rightfully seeks to complete the partial grasp of our popular thinking, by stating the necessary revelatory and metaphysical background out of which perfect character must proceed. Divine acts must find their rootage in divine life. The real Christ of to-day is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. It is the essential, the perennial Christ upon which we are to think and build the superstructure of our lives. The "New Theology"

must be the old, the oldest, the New Testament thought of Jesus; or it too must give us a fragmentary Christ.

Our knowledge of the heavens has come and will come only by patient observation through long centuries, and from different points of view. Astrology was succeeded by a crude astronomy. This blundering and partial astronomy was rectified and enlarged by wider observation and more exact calculation. Only a part of the heavens can be delineated by the astronomer who resides in Stockholm. Some man must go to Australia, if another section of the starry world is to find its rightful place in the astronomical scheme. A half century must pass, and men drag their telescopes to mountain tops, if the dashing comet of a past generation is to be seen by a later. From far apart points of vantage, men bring their varied observations and they are finally builded into one perfect, fiery, majestic, procession of the spheres.

Dare we look for any lesser analogy in picturing man's discovery and delineation of Jesus? He whom the heaven of heavens can not contain could not be depicted in a century. From different points of view, His full-orbed greatness has been gathered. Because He is the Christ of all days, *all* great and noble thought of Him must be gathered from every creed and confession.

THE NATURE OF CHRIST.

"What think ye of Christ?" "Whose son is he?" These questions were never more vital than to-day. He stands forth in the pages of the sacred Book a perpetual challenge to the mind and heart of mankind. He stood before friend and enemy and asked with grave, far reaching purpose—"Which of you convinceth me of sin?" Such a unique phenomenon in the history of mankind must be crushed or adored. Such moral perfection rising in the midst of an organically corrupt race must be accounted for. He must be convicted and rejected, or believed and enthroned.

His complete claims may be represented by two Biblical titles, "Son of Man" and "Son of God." The first was his own

favorite designation, adopted from the book of Daniel. The second title, used occasionally by Jesus in the synoptic gospels, finds its fullest expression in St. John's record. His first and constant claim was to be "the Son of Man." For the Jew, this unique title suggested the Messiah that was to come. Again and again, the question "Art thou the Messiah that is to come" was put to Him by friend and foe. Again and again, did He refrain from making a full acknowledgment of the implication. He knew He was the promised Messiah but around that idea had grown so many crude and fanciful notions of the Messianic reign that He saw the first need of the people was a spiritualizing of their conception of "The Son of Man." His "son of man" had a larger significance than their "Messiah." His was race old and world wide. Their's was tribal born and nation hemmed.

His claim made Him the new head of an old race, the second Adam in the moral history of the world. His claim made Him the supreme man of all ages past and to come. His claim made Him the focus of all the world's wisdom, power and affection. "I am the light of the world," "All power is given me in heaven and on earth," "I am the way, the truth and the life. no man cometh unto the Father but by me," these are a few of His stupendous claims. Do the thought and deeds and relation of Jesus to God and man substantiate his claim? To attempt to measure His thought aright, to enumerate his gracious deeds, and depict His tender relation to God, and His transforming relation to other men would carry us too far afield. Jesus still stands as the supreme spiritual teacher of the race. Whatever wise maxims Confucius may have given; whatever beautiful and optimistic interpretation of the universe we find in the Rig-Veda; whatever vivid contrast between the good and evil principle in life has been furnished by Zoroaster; whatever tender philanthropy was inculcated by Buddha; whatever triumphant moral contests are contributed by the religious dramas of Greece and the philosophy of Plato; whatever majestic conceptions of righteousness are depicted in the monotheism of Moses; in the teachings of Jesus, we find all these scattered elements of truth caught up and given a setting and an interpretation which

places His thoughts as the completed, spiritual focus of the world's noblest creeds.

His *deeds*, when brought to the more trying test of life, stamp with undeniable evidence His claim to moral perfection. In storm and calm; on the sea, or in the secrecy of the home; before the rabble, or before Herod; with His enemies, on the sunny sea beach, or nailed to His uplifted cross; when flattered, or taunted; on the Mt. of Hatti, nor in bloody Gethsemane; He never breaks from the minutest law of righteousness, or mars the communion of His eternal sonship with God. Other great natures may have preached truth, and plead for perfect virtue, but Jesus was equal to His word and realized in His own personality what was but dogma in the lives of other men. He still stands the one perfect embodiment of all that is strong, brave, true, pure, sympathetic and gracious in humanity. He is humanity at its highest, the flower and perfume of the race, "*The Son of Man*" among the sons of men. He is the world's high-priest because, although tempted in all points like as we are, yet He was without sin, and now, as then, "can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities."

If He was, and is the Son of Man, He was, and is just as truly "Son of God." We might base our belief on His own claim. If He encouraged His disciples to speak of "Our Father who art in heaven," He did not include Himself with them in such an address. Where He wished to speak of the Father who was common to them and Him, He adopted the particular expression, "My Father and your Father." Though the actual occasion of the phrase throws it into the lips of His adversaries, it was, we may rest assured, a phrase of His own: "He said that God was *His own* Father"—His Father, that is, in a peculiar and appropriate sense—"making himself equal with God." If there was some malicious exaggeration of his enemies in this latter charge, as Jesus seems to imply in the answer He makes, "the Son can do nothing of Himself," at least there is none in the former phrase, which exactly conveys the thought running through all His discourses, that God is His own Father. Clearly does He declare "He that sent me is with me; He hath not left

me alone; for I do always the things that are pleasing to him." It is this perfect correspondence to the will of God, rather than to Jesus own claim to an unique divine Sonship, which furnishes the most convincing proof of His divinity. Permit me, however, for a moment to pause and state the philosophic background for the incarnation. Creation is the world old, progressive, individuation of God. The world, however crude its form, must be a part of His being. Just how much of God's being has been poured into rock and stream, just how much richer in His life the flower and butterfly may be, just how much fuller of His substance the lion and the deer are, to assert how much of God there is in human life and divine sacrament is beyond the knowledge of man, but of one man it could be said, "that in Him dwelt *all* the fulness of the God-head bodily." Yes, bodily, for, if Jesus stood for anything, he stood for the fullest and clearest revelation of the Father, within the prison of human flesh. The doctrine of evolution has brought reinforcement to the doctrine of the incarnation. God has unveiled himself, at last, in the person of Jesus.

Let us return now to our claim that the perfection of the character of Jesus demands as a postulate His unique sonship with God.

The ethically perfect Christ must be explained. I know what the modern popular teacher is likely to say. "Granted," I hear him say, "the sinlessness and moral perfection of Jesus, why do you want to go back of His immaculate life to inquire into his genesis and nature?" Because, we reply, every phenomenon must have a cause. Because you can't have perfect actions without perfect character. Because you can't have perfect character without some superhuman addition to the race's moral stock in trade. The question of being always lurks behind human and divine action. A recent writer has said, "All religious philosophy will admit that in God there is the Eternal Prototype of humanity. All intelligent religious thinking must recognize in the Deity an eternal basis for the nature, the advent, the career and ideal, of mankind. What possible interest can human beings have in the Infinite if society is not organized out of his

life, if he is not the ground of its order and hope? What do we mean by the Being in whom every fatherhood in heaven and earth is named, if our God is not a fulness of love, if he is not in his innermost nature an eternal society? Is there anything in the Infinite to account for humanity? That is the deepest question in religious philosophy, and thinkers are everywhere converging upon the conclusion that in God there is the Eternal Pattern of our race. And what is this Eternal Pattern, or Prototype, but the Son of Man of the synoptic gospels, the Only Begotten of the Fourth Gospel, the Mediator of the Pauline Epistles, the High Priest without descent, with neither beginning of days nor end of years, of the letter to the Hebrews, the God of God, Light of Light, begotten, not made, of the Nicene Creed, who for us men and our salvation, came down, was made flesh, and became man. * * Loose out of faith the sense of the Eternal in Christ, fail to recognize in Him the presence of the Absolute, miss the fact that his nature is rooted in the Deity and part of the nature of God, and we let go the sole adequate support for belief in the consubstantiation of humanity with divinity, and the consciousness that Jesus is the moral ideal for mankind."

The difference that He presents to other men is not simply a difference of degree, but a difference in *kind*. The moment we admit Him to the exalted niche of sinlessness, and moral perfection, that moment he is in a class apart, and the ineffable beauty of His personality demands a closer relation to God than all other men born of women. It is because we find in Him the eternally human, and the humanly divine, that the poet can reverently declare

"If Jesus Christ is a man—
And only a man—I say
That of all mankind I cleave to Him,
And to Him will I cleave alway.

If Jesus Christ is a God—
And the only God—I swear
I will follow Him through Heaven and Hell,
The earth, the sea, and the air."

HIS WORK.

Every personality carries with it an influence. The measure of that influence furnishes the final estimate of the character. Reaching through nineteen centuries, we find a certain influence and institution which we call Christianity. Never was its power more effective than to-day. However much it has been caricatured, or debased, by priests and princelings, the main, vitalizing stream of its beneficent power surges onward into the centuries. However much its power has been augmented by philosophy, organization and wealth, its original life and redemptive force is not difficult to trace. "All great currents of history have flowed from persons. The world moves by personality. Christianity has a doctrine. But the force of Christianity, that which made it move and lent it power to move the world, is the person at the heart of it, who gives vitality to the organization and reality to the doctrine." Christ was his own gospel. Dr. Van Dyke has recently said:

"This was the secret of his ministry. He himself was the central word of His own preaching. He offered himself to the world as the solution of its difficulties and the source of a new life. He asked men simply to believe in Him, to love Him, to follow Him. He called the self-righteous to humble themselves to His correction, the sinful to confide in his forgiveness, the doubting to trust his assurance, and the believing to accept His guidance into fuller light. To those who became His disciples he gave doctrine and instruction in many things. But to those who were not yet His disciples, to the world, he offered first of all Himself—not a doctrine, not a plan of life, but a living Person. This was the substance of His first sermon when He stood up in the synagogue at Nazareth, and, having read from the book of Isaiah the prophecy of the Great Liberator, declared unto the people, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." This was the attraction of his universal invitation, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." This was the heart of his summary of his completed work when he said, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."

Now, the first element of His work which distinguishes Christ is that He saves from sin. Let all mere doctrines of sin, atonement and justification be, for the present, forgotten and let us look at the bare facts of history. In His presence the publican and the harlot broke down, and all their brazen challenge of social law ceased, amid the sobs of a melting penitence. At His feet, the burdened consciences of millions of lives have been laid. Before His cross, uncounted multitudes have been checked in their reckless career of sinful indulgence. At His word, the uplifted hand of murderous anger has dropped at the side of the enraged assailant. At His glance, the endangered chastity of his spiritual children has been protected and enshrined. Stumble as we may over the mere explanation of his redemptive power, the fact that at His feet the hatred of sin, and the sense of pardon is realized by countless men and women is beyond denial. From sheer love of Him thousands, who have come up out of sin, stand as living witness of His transmitted grace and righteousness. This is the gospel needed for our age of doubt. Jesus Christ is the great, living, redemptive force of the age. For a higher appreciation of this fact, one has but to turn to that Oriental religion which makes the nearest approach, in its ethics, to Christianity—Buddhism. Who that knows Buddhism, in theory and practice, would make any serious claim for its moral and spiritual dynamic. Beautiful as may be the mythic life of its founder, his practical atheism, and passive acquiescence in the endless cycle of helpless reincarnations, make his so-called religion a beautiful dream that is never actualized in life. Indeed the land of its birth, has largely repudiated it, and Japan where it is now most largely domesticated, is turning towards the only virile, regenerative moral force—Christianity. Life comes only through life. The redemptive force of our religion springs from the Christ of All Days. It is not too much to claim that historically, His is the only name given under heaven whereby men can be saved.

Rescue, by suppression of sin, is after all but the lower side of the redemptive work of Jesus. His own characteristic ut-

terance was, "I am come that ye might have life and that ye might have it in abundance." When the St. Paul's huge, black bulk lay stranded on the bar off Long-Branch, men cheered every effort of steam tug and her own engines to drag her into the open sea. Her rescue from imminent destruction was the first consideration. When at last, with the help of the uplifting, storm swelled tide, she floated clear and erect on the safe bosom of the sea, a mighty shout of joy and congratulation went up to heaven. But the St. Paul was not yet at her best. Not until reladened with her freight of merchandise and human life; not until her engines throbbed and she plunged eastward across the tempestuous Atlantic, carrying a myriad blessings and hopes to distant shores, was she truly saved — saved for service. Let this incident illustrate the truth in hand.

The rescue of a soul from sin is great, but the enrichment and satisfaction of that soul, by the inpouring life of Jesus, is a still richer experience and fact. Just here, it seems to me, many teachers of our religion have gone astray. Their Christianity has been one of repression and asceticism. To crush out sin is a partial truth. To grow in grace and in a knowledge of our Lord is the truer, endless, development into which we are called. The one is a negative cutting off of egoism, the other, is a conserving, directing, enrichment of the basal forces of life. To transform these animal forces into spiritual forces; to give higher efficiency and nobler purpose to what life we have; to carry us, with the full momentum of an abounding life, to our ordained goal, these are the higher gifts of His transmitted life. It is Christ taking the small and insignificant things of life and touching them with His own divine being, thus making them potent for the feeding of the multitude, that make His influence the supreme spiritual power of history. It is His awakening touch of the dormant spiritual life of men, this feeding and inspiring for the most heroic deeds of all time, that perpetuates His claim to be the man of all days.

Reluctantly must I leave this important but crude statement of His work, and view, for a moment, the future, the vision which he has set for our encouragement.

HIS VISION.

The universalism of Jesus is not an accidental note in His program. It was clearly contemplated in those last great days of the apostolic commission, "Go ye into all the world make disciples of all nations." Though born a Jew, and inheriting the Hebrew traditions of nationality and religion, His vision swept far beyond His people and leaped the ceremonial barriers erected by every national cult. Fairbairn has said, "The belief in a person who was equally related to all men involved the notion that the men who were so related to Him were equally related to each other; and the other conception that he had died to redeem all, make all appear of equal value in his sight and of equal worth before God, who indeed as the God of Jesus Christ could know no respect of person. For in Christ there was neither Jew nor Greek, bond or free, but only one new man." Thus Jesus furnishes the most comprehensive and intensive of all world programs. For a clearer appreciation of this universalism of Jesus we have but to recall the limited view and provision made by the ethnic religions of antiquity. Each nation had its own God or gods, limited in control to the tribe, and circumscribed in time by the national existence. "Whether we turn to the Greeks in the west, or to the Assyrians in the east, we find that religion was not so much a matter of soul as of soil. There could be no religion without a country, and citizenship was indissolubly bound up with loyalty to the God or gods presiding over a district. To the Romans, after the fall of Jerusalem, both Jews and Christians appeared as "without God"—atheists. But Christ knew no national boundaries for His religion. He instituted no rites which contracted his discipleship into a tribe. Nothing short of humanity itself was the limit of His vision. Out of every nation, those who received Him could enter his kingdom. Without distinction of caste, color, condition or race all were bidden to the feast of divine sonship and communion. The marvel still grows, as we contemplate the fact that all occupations, all service, all human activities were to be swept within the circle of religion. Life itself was the sacred thing. No one class, or no one vocation was to be called holy

VOL. XXVII. No. 1. 17

but all noble service was to receive the seal of His approving spirit. Nor were the different social and political institutions to be left without the pale of religion. The family and the state were to be permeated by the same spirit, and fashioned by the same law as the Church. Nothing human was to escape the gentle sway of His divine law. Education, music, art, industry, science, trade, literature—all human relations were to be brought beneath the spell of His harmonious life. He has set an ideal before the race which it feels bound to realize, though it may step with slow and labored reluctance.

I have said that His religion was the most intensive of all other moral schemes presented for man's betterment. It is the most intensive because it gets its creative and propulsive power from something deeper than the intellect and the moral law. It finds its controlling and creative principle in the heart of God. God is holy love. This is its profoundest definition of God. This is its supreme gift to man. Love is the creative and all comprehending principle of his religion. Obedience to Allah is the highest, and commanding motive for the Mohammedan. A humble reverence for Jehovah was the nearest approach antiquity offered to the full and free communion of the individual soul with God. Not until Jesus disclosed the eternal motive and heart of God, did the universal and intense love of God bring men into perfect communion with Himself. It was because of this universal love of God for humanity, that Jesus declared His faith in the final good for all mankind.

"One God, one law, one element
And one far off divine event
To which the whole creation moves."

The result of this faith and love is the brotherhood of man in Christ Jesus. Already, it is building our hospitals and homes for the aged and the broken wrecks of the streets; already, it makes the rich Dives of our modern Jerusalem restless at his sumptuous table; already, it has asserted the civil equality of all men; already, it has made war among kindred peoples fratricidal; already, it has banded the sons of toil in near and distant lands for a common defence and improvement; already, it has broken racial barriers and opened hermit nations; already, the

lowest classes socially have been swept within the consideration of the social élite; already, we talk of Anglo-Saxon federation and world-wide parliaments for the peace of the earth. What else is to come, through His benign leadership, who can tell? What Christ was, the ideal man, that humanity is becoming. "His words sought their audience a thousand or two thousand years ahead." After Renan had done his worst, in the pitiless criticism of Christ, he closes his *Life of Jesus* with this testimony—"Whatever may be the unexpected phenomena of the future, Jesus will never be surpassed. His worship will unceasingly renew its youth; his legends will be the source of endless tears; the best of hearts will be melted by his sufferings; all the ages will proclaim that among the sons of men there has not been born one greater than Jesus." He is taking His rightful place. Still we must sing with the wild bells of Tennyson:

"Ring out the grief that saps the mind
For those that here we seek no more;
Ring out the feud of rich and poor,
Ring in redress to all mankind.

Ring out a slowly dying cause,
And ancient forms of party strife;
Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

Ring in the valiant man and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in THE CHRIST THAT IS TO BE."

ARTICLE IX.

SKETCH OF REV. ELIJAH HAWKINS.

BY J. A. BROWN, D. D.

Rev. Elijah Hawkins is justly entitled to a place in our series of ministerial sketches. It would be an act of injustice to the Church did we fail to rescue from oblivion the memory of one so greatly honored and so universally esteemed.

He was born March 3d, 1811, in Newberry District, S. C., and died at his home in Smyth Co., Va., March 5th, 1868. Aged, 57 years and two days.

Of his early history we have very little knowledge. We learn, however, that his parents were very devoted Christians, and that when Elijah was born and his twin brother died, his mother prayed fervently that God would spare his life that she might dedicate him to the Gospel ministry. Her prayer was answered, and when quite young he commenced preparation for this great work. He graduated with distinction at the Theological Seminary at Lexington, S. C., under the tuition of Dr. Hazelius. Soon after his graduation he was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of South Carolina, and came to Virginia more as a missionary than in answer to any special call from congregations. He commenced his labors in Smyth and Washington counties in the year 1836, was ordained in Zion's Church, Wythe county, Va., in May, 1838, by the North Carolina Synod which at that time embraced all the churches in south-west Virginia. He spent the whole of his ministerial life of about thirty years in Smyth and adjoining counties. When he commenced his labors here there were only two other Lutheran ministers (Revs. J. Scherer and J. J. Gruver) who occupied this entire field, each of them serving four or five congregations. Besides the great distances they had to travel over hills and mountains, the roads were sometimes almost impassable. There were no railroads or even turnpikes yet in existence here. All these inconveniences had to be met, but like good soldiers of the cross they went

forth in the name of their Master, and by their great labors and self-denials planted the churches we now occupy.

In the year, 1842, the Synod of South-west Virginia was organized. Rev. Hawkins was one of its founders and its first secretary, and until the year of his death was ever regarded as one of its leading spirits. As an evidence of his punctuality and interest in all our church work, we learn from the ministers of synod that during his long connection with this body he was in attendance at every annual meeting with one exception, and for many years occupied some official position in synod.

To say that Bro. Hawkins was a good man is not enough. To say simply that he was faithful in the discharge of his ministerial duties is not enough. It does not express his real character. He was one of the most efficient men we have ever had amongst us, laboring with untiring zeal in season and out of season. Though always feeble in body, yet through the parching heat of summer and the winds and snows of winter, he would plod his way over these hills and mountains to meet his appointments and deliver his Master's message. His faithfulness and punctuality always secured for him good congregations. No one thought of being disappointed if it were possible for Bro. Hawkins to meet his engagements.

There was something very beautiful and attractive in his private character. His heart was as warm as a child's, as kind as a woman's, and as true as steel. His countenance was an index of his heart, open and generous and pure. He was an "Israelite indeed in whom was no guile, one of Christ's beloved disciples." He had no talent for intrigue and never connived at what he knew to be wrong. In all his intercourse with men he exhibited that childlike simplicity which is always characteristic of a pure heart, utterly incapable of an intentional wrong.

As a preacher, Mr. Hawkins was remarkably gifted. He was always prepared for any emergency. He made no pretensions to eloquence in the popular sense of that term, but was always prepared to present the plain, simple truths of the Gospel in such a way as to command the attention of all who heard him, having no disposition to discuss matters of minor importance. Mere ceremonials or peculiar modes of worship received

but little sympathy from him. But the great questions connected with our duty in this life and our destiny in the life to come were always uppermost in his mind and the themes of his discourses. "Am I living for Christ?" "Do I believe in his name?" "Am I discharging my whole duty in trying to bring sinners to Jesus?" Such questions always interested him.

I have already stated that Mr. Hawkins was remarkably gifted as an extemporaneous speaker. All his performances were extemporaneous. He never wrote his sermons—never used notes even. And to my certain knowledge he could prepare a well arranged systematic discourse in a few hours, and it is well known that he seldom made any preparation until the morning of the day when he was to preach. He once assisted me on a sacramental occasion. He came to my house on Saturday. We passed the evening in social conversation. On Sabbath morning he asked, "What subject do you wish me to use to-day—please suggest something." I referred to my scrap-book and read several skeletons which were prepared when at the theological seminary. One of these seemed to please him, and from it he gave us a very creditable and edifying sermon. In fact his sermons were always edifying and instructive. He seemed to understand by intuition the character of his people and know how to adapt himself to their wants. Hence his churches were always in a growing condition spiritually and numerically. He was a strong advocate of genuine revivals of religion, and some of his churches were almost in a constant state of revival.

Mr. Hawkins exerted great influence over the members of synod as well as over the people of his charge. But it was rather a silent influence. He seldom participated in the discussions of Synod. A few words from him were sufficient. In fact there were few theological combats to be fought in those days; no dogmas to attack or defend. It was sin and Satan and the powers of darkness that had to be met, and faithfully did he and his ministerial associates meet them. As an evidence of his influence and the confidence his people had in him the following incident may be mentioned. Many years ago there was a general rebellion amongst the students of Roanoke College. The exercises were entirely suspended. Nearly all

the students had arrayed themselves against the authorities of the institution, demanding redress for supposed wrongs which they had received. The whole Lutheran Church throughout the state was agitated and the very existence of the college was threatened. A meeting of the Board of Trustees, of which Mr. Hawkins was a member, was called to reconcile existing difficulties. When his people learned that their pastor was going to the meeting of the Board they were quite satisfied, believing that he would make all right.

Having a well disciplined mind and a thorough theological education, Mr. Hawkins was qualified for almost any position in the church. He received several calls to professorships in colleges all of which he declined. He seemed to have no higher aspiration than that of a country pastor. His reply to these calls was, "I am called to preach the Gospel, not to teach." This he regarded as his great life-work. And this he continued to do faithfully and earnestly until a short time before his death.

In his physical structure, Mr. Hawkins had an exceedingly cadaverous appearance, so lean and lank and slender that during the last years of his life he was reduced to a mere shadow, perhaps not weighing more than one hundred pounds. At his last appointment, which was at Kimberlin, he was so feeble that he could scarcely reach his home, having to stop and rest several times on his way.

The closing scenes of his life were truly affecting. A few days before his death he called his family to his bed-side. To his children he said, "Don't lose your souls for the trifling things of earth," and then asked them to sing "Gently, Lord, O gently lead us," he saying, "My sentiments and hope of heaven are expressed in that hymn better than I can tell you for want of strength." Then turning to his weeping companion he said, "We have worshiped God together for a long time: keep on, don't grow weary in well doing, we will soon meet again." A few moments before he breathed his last, embracing his wife, he exclaimed, "I'm over safe and dry, meet me there. How beautiful! How beautiful!" When asked what it was, he replied, "I can't tell you. Good bye!" and expired.

Thus after a long life of usefulness, his work completed—

surrounded by his family—his mind calm—his faith strong—his hopes bright—this good man fell asleep in Jesus. And even after death had done its work that placid smile so peculiar to him still lighted up his countenance and spoke of the happiness he was no doubt then enjoying. Well may we exclaim if this be the way the Christian can die, "Let me die the death of the righteous and let my last end be like his."

The services connected with his burial are still fresh in the memory of many, and the tears shed on that occasion were an appropriate testimony to his exalted worth. He was carried to the little graveyard near the church he loved so well at Pleasant Hill. Short addresses were delivered by Revs. L. A. Mann, A. Phillippi, E. H. McDonald and the writer of this sketch. Here he sleeps his last sleep, guarded not only by God's ministering angels, but by the everlasting mountains that stand around him on every side. He approached his grave "like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams."

Long years will pass away before the beloved memory and blessed labors of Elijah Hawkins will be forgotten. He leaves to his family, his friends and the church a record of which all may be proud. Amid all the conflicts of his eventful life not a blemish ever sullied his character. Not a stain tarnished his fair name he has left behind him. Never perhaps in the memory of the present generation has one fallen among us so universally esteemed.

"Servant of God, well done.
Rest from thy loved employ.
The battle fought, the victory won,
Enter thy Master's joy."

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

IMPORTED BY CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

History of Egypt. The XVIIth and XVIII Dynasties. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Vol. II. pp. 340. Price \$2.25.

We will soon be as familiar with the history of Egypt as we are with that of England. Prof. Petrie, who stands at the head of the eminent specialists, is peculiarly qualified for the task he has undertaken by reason of his long residence in Egypt and his fruitful discoveries while excavating its ruins. The volume before us, the second in a series of seven, gives an account of the continued efforts of the Egyptian princes to throw off the yoke of the Hyksos, and their final success under the victorious Aahmes, the founder of the XVIIIth dynasty. The monuments, which have been silent for so many ages, are here made to speak and to reveal the life story of the successive rulers of this dynasty, their military campaigns and great battles, their triumphs in peace and their achievements in building temples and tombs. We have full descriptions of the reigns of Hatshepsu, the Queen Bess of Egypt, of Tehutimes III, the Alexander the Great and of Akhenaten the heretic. A number of explanatory notes, a chapter on the mummies found at Deir el Bahri and a copious index complete the volume. The whole is a work of great research, and will be authoritative on Egyptian history. We await with impatience the appearance of the next volume. T. C. B.

The Expository Times. Edited by Rev. James Hastings, A. M. Vol. VII. October 1895—September 1896. 4to. pp. 568. \$2.50 net.

It is a great satisfaction to the reviewer to have the bound copy of another volume of this standard periodical. With contributions from the foremost Biblical scholars of Great Britain on a wide diversity of scriptural and ecclesiastical subjects, and with its candid and searching reviews of recent theological literature, its twelve monthly issues constitute a volume of permanent value, to be placed at a convenient part of the library. It is an enrichment to any library, and clergymen of studious habits are to be commiserated if they are not subscribers to the wide-awake and solid monthly. E. J. W.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola, by Professor Pasquale Villari. With portraits and illustrations. pp. 792. \$2.50.

The bringing out of a popular edition of the English translation of VOL. XXVII. No. 1. 18

this well-known and principal work on the immortal Italian Reformer, will be appreciated, we doubt not, by a large body of readers. To all students of religious history Savonarola continues to be a subject of perennial and inexhaustible interest. A Reformer before the Reformation, what proofs he offers both of the deplorable corruption of the Roman hierarchy, and of the impotence of all efforts at reform not aimed at the core of this corruption, the false doctrines which prevailed! In the clear recognition and open confession of the abounding disorder, as well as in his defiance of the Pope, Savonarola may be indeed regarded as a precursor of Luther, but the Friar who publicly declared that "he desired to make no changes of dogma," thereby showed himself lacking the first requisite for the purification of God's House. On the other hand in his combination of political with religious reform, in his preaching of the most vigorous morality, and in his invectives against amusements and his "burning of the vanities" on the last day of the Carnival, he showed himself the true prototype of Calvin, and many pages of Florentine history during Savonarola's ascendancy read like a chapter of Geneva when John Calvin held ecclesiastical and secular sway in that city.

The English of this edition is so idiomatic and flowing that the reader is never reminded that it is a translation, except by a few original excerpts from the Friar's writings, especially his poetry. It is a work which commends itself to all lovers of a literature which blends charming style with solid instruction.

E. J. W.

God the Creator and Lord of All. By Samuel Harris, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale University. Two volumes. pp. 579, 576. Price, \$5.00.

These two fine volumes are of superior excellence. No one will read far in them without realizing that they have been written by a master. They virtually cover Dr. Harris' scheme of systematic theology including also, as an outgrowth, his system of Christian ethics. He begins by defining theology as "the intellectual apprehension and expression of what God really is in his relation to the universe, and especially to man, and of what man and the universe are in their relation to God," and shows the importance of theology as the intellectual element in religion. After clearing away some current misconceptions about theology, he argues that theological investigation accords with the spirit and teaching of the Bible; that it is essential to the preservation and purity of Christian belief and also of Christian character and life; that it is necessary to the effective preaching of the Gospel; and that theology should be studied in reference to the questions of the day.

After this fine introductory chapter, preparing one well for what follows, he enters upon the discussion of the doctrines treated. Beginning with "God the Absolute Spirit" he reasons with clear definitions and logic in support of his propositions and meets with just as clear-

cut argument some prevalent misconceptions of God's revelation of himself, in his word, as the Absolute Spirit. He goes on then with the attributes of God as the Absolute Being—his self-existence, omnipresence, eternity, etc.; his essential attributes of reason, free will and feeling as Spirit; his benevolence to man and his love in redemption; the doctrine of the Trinity; the Person of Christ; the Atonement. Part II treats of God the Creator; III, God the Lord of All in Providential Government; IV, God the Lord of All in Moral Government.

There is careful reasoning here and philosophical argument all through. And some may think it is as dull as it is logical, that the very nature of the general subject implies this. The dullness, however, is relieved by happy illustrations and interesting notes and the constant application, especially under IV, to the current thought and the needs of men to-day. This is one of the special merits of this meritorious work.

There is something lacking, however, in the discussion on the Person of Christ, and the doctrines of Baptism and the Lord's Supper receive very scant attention. On the subject of free will Dr. Harris writes much like a Lutheran, but on the Person of Christ his theology is of the distinctively Reformed type. But where there is so much to commend we refrain from taking further exception. The work may receive attention hereafter in a formal article.

Europe in the Middle Age. By Oliver J. Thatcher, Ph. D., and Ferdinand Schwill, Ph. D. With Maps and Charts. pp. 681. Price, \$2.00.

This is intended as a text-book for the use of the freshman and sophomore classes in our colleges. For this reason the authors felt less unrestrained than if there had been no such definite purpose in view during its preparation. We are not lacking in literature on this period, and yet there is a place for this book, for no other will serve so well as a text-book for the college student. Hallam was the reader's chief hand-book for many years but his work has now been superseded by others—chiefly by those of Emerton, Adams, Bryce, Lavis and Rambaud (10 volumes), and Symonds (*Renaissance in Italy*, 6 volumes). Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* still holds its high place. But these are for the student's general reading rather than for the class-room.

The authors speak of using the topical arrangement because of the conditions and limitations they were under in preparing the work as a text-book. No apology is necessary on this point. It is an excellent feature, and will likely please the general reader as well as meet the wants of the student in college. The interest varies, but every chapter gives satisfaction. We speak with special satisfaction of the ones on the Migration of the Nations, the Dismemberment of the Empire, Feudalism, the Growth of the Papacy, Monasticism, the Civilization of the Middle Age, and the Italian Renaissance. But why discriminate

where all are so good. The authors have succeeded in their purpose to prepare a text-book, and more: they have furnished for the public an excellent book for reading.

Jesus Christ Before His Ministry. By Edmund Stapfer, Professor in the Faculty of Protestant Theology in Paris. Translated by Louise Seymour Houghton. pp. 182. Price, \$1.25.

This will be followed by two more volumes, the one on "Jesus Christ during His Ministry" and the other on "The Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ." In the present one the author clearly reveals the standpoint from which he views the person and work of Christ. While reverent and sympathetic, presenting the Master as the wonder of his age, he ascribes to him nothing beyond the human in his birth or character. He says himself (p. 164): "We believe that it was the inward development of his moral consciousness which led Jesus to declare himself the Saviour of the world." In his view-point he differs from Strauss and Renan but he makes Jesus no more super-human than they. The devout believer will not accept his views though he will confess that they are most plausibly presented and that the book makes most fascinating reading. How he will explain the miracles we are curious to see. The work has been translated into excellent idiomatic English.

The Power of Thought. What it is and what it does. By John Douglas Sterrett. With an Introduction by J. Mark Baldwin, Professor of Psychology in Princeton University. pp. 320. Price, \$1.75.

It is not an easy thing to discuss psychological subjects without the technical terms of that science, but Mr. Sterrett has, in large measure, accomplished this task. Professional psychologists will likely take issue with him on not a few points treated here in familiar and popular language, but would not the same likely be the result with works issued by members of their own special class? Professor Baldwin, in somewhat guarded terms, commends this book as having the two merits of being interesting and at the same time free from the fault of weakening science by treating it in language familiar to the popular mind. He thinks, too, it will be found "trustworthy by the general reader, and also available by teachers in search of a text-book in the elements of psychology." We are inclined to accept his judgment, though we think that he, in giving this commendation, leaned a little more to the promptings of a generous heart than to the judgment of a cool head.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Baptism and Feet-washing. By Rev. P. Bergstresser, D. D. pp. 232. Price, \$1.00.

Here we have the finished product of a discussion held in 1879 by the author with a leading representative of a sect which holds to immersion as the only proper mode of baptism and to feet-washing as a sacrament.

Dr. Bergstresser came out of that discussion as the acknowledge victor and with his reputation as a theological debater much enhanced. Two thousand copies of the debate, in large pamphlet, were printed and sold; and the calls for more, along with the suggestion from influential men that he publish his argument in book-form, have led him to prepare this volume. It is a revised and enlarged treatment of the subject in three parts—the mode of baptism, the subjects of baptism, and feet-washing.

All who are acquainted with Dr. Bergstresser know of his careful and painstaking methods as a writer. With these methods, he applied to his task his powers as a cool debater and his exceptional and enviable familiarity with the word of God. From the armory of the Scriptures he fortifies every position taken and in the completed work renders himself impregnable. Whatever heat of debate is left does not mar at all the solid reasoning of the discussion but rather adds life to the book and makes it all the more readable. It is a book for the layman as well as the preacher, the author's style being marked by a clearness and directness of statement that render his thought easily intelligible without detracting from the strength of the argument.

It is but just to add also that this volume is a credit to its publishers as well as to its author, and its merits, in mechanical make-up and contents, along with the reasonable price, should secure for it a ready sale.

Life Reminiscences of an Old Lutheran Minister. By John G. Morris, D. D. pp. 396. Price, \$1.25.

To any one who knew Dr. Morris either personally or through his writings, there will be no question as to the authenticity of these life reminiscences. In them will be found the same familiar and entertaining style that appeared in his communications to the press—the same, too, that appeared in his conversations in the social circle and made him so companionable. He wrote just as he talked, whether recording facts, relating an incident, telling a story, or giving his opinion of any plan, enterprise, institution, book or man. It is Dr. Morris all through, and the reader who takes up the book will want to do as we did—read it from cover to cover before laying it aside.

Dr. Morris was born in 1803. He entered upon his ministry in the days of small things in the Lutheran Church, lived through its struggles and strifes for nearly three-fourths of a century, watched its progress with the keenest interest, and felt a gratification over the strength and influence it has attained in these last years second to none within its bounds. He had a special reason for this gratification in the fact that he himself was an important factor in many of the enterprises that specially contributed to its growth. In some of them, indeed, he was the originator. He became an active adherent of the General Synod soon after its organization. He attended its meetings when its mem-

bership counted less than a score, and was a delegate at its last convention when its roll numbered many scores, sent by the unanimous vote of the Maryland Synod as the head of its delegation of sixteen. Unswerving in his devotion to the General Synod, he also had a warm place in his heart for his Lutheran brethren of the other general bodies, and was in turn highly esteemed by them.

In authorship he treated of themes chiefly theological, historical and scientific. He wrote many books and magazine articles, and his newspaper communications would fill volumes. He was a member of a number of historical and scientific societies, and the esteem in which he was held is attested by the resolutions passed by these societies at the time of his death. In reading these reminiscences we are more than ever impressed with the many-sidedness of Dr. Morris and the high degree of excellence he attained on these many sides. Get the book. You will read it through, if you once begin.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Annotations on the Gospel According to St. Luke. By H. Louis Baugher, D. D. pp. 451.

Dr. Baugher has special qualifications as an expositor of the Bible, especially of the New Testament. He is a proficient Greek scholar, loves the word and has implicit faith in it, is fond of Bible study, and expresses himself in clear and vigorous language. With these qualifications his attainments as a theologian raise the expectation of a good commentary on the book assigned him by the editor of this series. This expectation has been met by these annotations on the Gospel according to St. Luke. The scholar is lost in the earnest Bible student, and the sub-title of the Lutheran Commentary as "a plain exposition of the Holy Scriptures of the New Testament," is here successfully met, and that, too, without weakening it.

As part of a series bearing the title, "The Lutheran Commentary," the book properly has a Lutheran trend in its interpretation of Scripture whose meaning has been viewed in a different light by the respective churches. We would expect the same principle to hold in a Presbyterian or Baptist commentary, as in fact we do find in the case of the American Commentary issued by the Baptist Publication Society. And yet there is no going out of his way by the author to make the denominational feature conspicuous. Wherever it appears it is not obtruded but comes in naturally.

Like some others of the series, thus far issued, this is mainly a verse by verse commentary. It will meet the wants of the Sunday-school teacher as well as the preacher, and prove a valuable addition to Lutheran literature.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON.

Christianity and Social Problems. By Lyman Abbott. pp. 370. Price, \$1.25.

It is refreshing to take up a book of this kind. Especially refreshing is it after reading or hearing the many unsatisfying and, in many cases, unreasonable solutions of our social problems as given in to-day's books and magazines or from the lecture platform. The author shows that Christ had a mission to society as well as to the individual, and that his methods and principles, if followed, would give us the brotherhood among men for which we long and pray. The distinctive socialist would raise up the degraded by giving them better food and cleaner clothes, better streets and dwellings, by introducing industrial and other schools, but is usually silent as to their moral and spiritual needs, indeed in many instances he is even opposed to the divine institution that aims to give the moral and spiritual uplift. But Christ's method was different. To quote from Dr. Abbott, "he did not begin with the bottom of man and work up to the top: he began at the top and worked down toward the bottom. He did not attempt to lift man up by a leverage applied from below; he attempted to lift them up by a hand reached down from above" (p. 135). The socialist would improve man by improving his environment; Christ, by improving his character. This can be taken as the basis or general trend of treatment in all the thirteen chapters. On every page there is a full appreciation of the worth of man as man, and yet, throughout all its pages, there is nothing of the demagogic spirit that would array the so-called lower classes against the higher.

Some books on Socialism may be read with profit by the employer; a few may be read without harm by the employee; but this can be read with marked profit by both employer and employee, capitalist and laborer, by all indeed who seek to lift up or be lifted up without pulling others down.

Chapters from a Life. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps.

It was with great gratification that the many admirers and friends of Elizabeth Stuart Phelps received the announcement that they were to have her autobiography. Strong influence was brought to bear upon her, and she was finally persuaded to lay aside a life-long determination not to write of her own life and experience in this manner; and all her readers, but more especially the readers whom she has more closely attached to herself through the not-to-be-forgotten story of *A Singular Life*, are charmed with the result. She has written in a style so thoroughly pleasing that the remark of one reader has been, "If we were to have many such autobiographies, fiction would lose its charm." Much of interest has been connected with the writer's life. Born and reared in Andover, she was associated in her own family and outside of

it with many of the great minds of the century. Many of the most vexed and vexing theological questions have excited and disturbed the atmosphere in which she found her existence, and they left their impressions upon her which she here gives to her readers, and they are rejoiced to find her own faith unshaken, sweet and simple as a child's. She has been contemporaneous with and has had for her personal friends many of the most brilliant lights of this period, among them Mrs. Stowe, Longfellow, Whittier, Holmes, James T. Fields, Lucy Larcom, Phillips Brooks, Celia Thaxter and many others, and of these she gives such personal glimpses as are truly delightful. But we have enjoyed most the glimpses she has here given us of her own life, of its joys and sorrows, its struggles and successes, its fears and surprises, and of its loneliness and companionships. Perhaps it is the way of telling it (for never has Mrs. Ward wielded her pen more gracefully) that makes her life-story so pleasing, but we think that very much more of interest than is usual has attached itself to the life of this writer who has succeeded in a rare manner in making her readers her friends. Of the great love that has come into her life she has written most delicately. A number of excellent illustrations, chief among them a fine likeness of the writer, are among the many charms of this delightful book.

Marm Lisa. By Kate Douglas Wiggin.

Mrs. Wiggin's connection with Kindergarten work and her love for little children coupled with a keen discernment of their nature and disposition has enabled her to write many beautiful sketches of child-life. She has revealed in all of these such an appreciation of the sorrows of childhood, its pathos and humor, its great craving for love and sympathy as has touched many hearts, and attached to herself many who have honored her for this womanly characteristic. Rarely does any one possess in common such sympathy with sorrow and such a keen sense of humor as does Mrs. Wiggin, and, perhaps, nowhere does she display this two-fold power more than in this new story. "Mrs. Grubb" is delineated in manner entirely irresistible, and her connection with the manifold organizations of the day is given in a style that not only entertains and amuses but does not fail to point a moral. "Mistress Mary" is a character of remarkable sweetness and purity whose philosophizing on Christmas alone would make the book worth reading, a character which in many things may well prove an example. The children of the story are unique, while "Marm Lisa" awakens the sympathy of the reader until it becomes almost painful. Characters more diverse, more consistently drawn and sustained than these, it would be difficult to find and there are many lessons of the beauty of service for others taught here in such a forceful manner that they must almost of necessity be learned.

The Poems of Celia Thaxter.

Sarah Orne Jewett has prefaced this collection of Mrs. Thaxter's poems with a just and beautiful estimate of her character and work and it is a fit prelude to the songs that follow it. Truly they are songs, and they breathe the deepest feelings of that great heart which learned for itself Life's fullest meanings. To her came her portion of sorrow and of torturing doubts, but the light followed and out of a life full of the heart's richest treasures she wrote. Very many of these poems breathe of the sea and we find scattered all through them the lessons learned from its weeds, its breakers, its tides, its crafts, its wrecks and its graves. Mrs. Thaxter loved nature; its birds and flowers, its sunrises and sunsets were much to her and of these she sings in sweetest strains. And she loved and valued her friends, and she has penned poems that are rare tributes to the worth of those friends. Music and art, too, claimed a large share of her attention and to these she pays her homage in most perfect verse. Of the sentiments that are hers she has written most freely, and in Sorrow, Courage, Remembrance, Wherefore, Alone, Philosophy, and many others she has given us glimpses into what Mrs. Ward has been pleased to call "her luxurious heart." These poems are so fresh, so pure, so elevating that they deserve to find a place in every library.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY PRESS, CHICAGO.

Origin and Development of the Nicene Theology, with some reference to the Ritchlian view of Theology and History of Doctrine. By Hugh M. Scott, D. D. 8vo. pp. 390.

This volume by the learned Chicago theologian contains a course of Six Lectures delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary, in January, 1896. They present the Nicene theology in its genesis and growth "as it sets forth or shadows the Person and work of the Divine Christ." The point of view from which they were prepared is the question, "What think ye of Christ," the testing inquiry to be put to all doctrines as well as to all men. The objective point is, however, the Ritchlian position, "the agnostic, positivistic, temper, which attacks the most precious doctrines of Christianity as essentially pagan." It is, we think, the first attempt in English to outline the growth of the Nicene theology with any real reference to this destructive critical school.

It does not come a moment too soon. And for this breakwater against the incoming tide of error a great debt is due to the enterprise of Princeton and to the author's prodigious research, his ample familiarity with the subject, and his clear apprehension of the danger to American religious circles from the approach of this "undogmatic Christianity." On the latter point a sentence or two from the preface shows by what manner of spirit the work is characterized: "The ap-

VOL. XXVII. No. 1.

19

peals 'Back to Christ,' the claim to represent 'the historic Christ,' the play upon 'the consciousness of Christ' * * are often an 'Open sesame' for these foreign teachings. Then the new science of 'Christian Sociology,' which makes the Church institutional, and emphasizes 'environment' as well as 'heredity,' by its teachings about the kingdom of God, prepares the way for Ritchie's theology of Christ and the Church."

The conclusion of the author, so ably and so cogently maintained as to make it the conclusion of his readers, is that our Lord is not "a product of Hellenism," that the Nicene doctrine is not a Hellenistic modification of a faith which in its original form was widely different, but a normal development from primitive Christian truths, not indeed unaffected by both Hellenism and Judaism as divinely ordained factors.

It would be too much to claim that Prof. Foster is always absolutely fair to the teachers he criticises, that he is not chargeable with overstatement of their theories and with drawing conclusions which they themselves would repudiate, but he impresses you with his desire to be just and discriminating, and he gives abundant evidence of having carefully sought to learn the truth from leading representatives of all the great German schools.

Prepared especially for students of divinity and for studious ministers, it is a work deserving the widest diffusion in those circles.

E. J. W.

LEA BROTHERS AND COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA.

A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church, by Henry Charles Lea, LL. D. Three vols, 8vo., pp. 523, 514, 629.

We owe our readers as well as the publishers an apology for not having in this issue a full notice of this great work, which a competent critic pronounces "in many respects the largest and most important historical work produced in this country during the last year."

The delay has been absolutely inevitable. Our next issue may be expected to present an ample review.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Christian Democracy. A History of its Suppression and Revival. By John McDowell Leavitt, D. D., LL. D. pp. 391.

The subjects treated in this work cover a wide range. The author wields a graphic as well as a polemic pen, whose effusions will not always find universal assent. What he says on the democratic claim of church polity will be heartily endorsed by all who repudiate the hierarchical claim. According to this "the communion of believers, lay and clerical together, constitute the Christian Commonwealth. * * The sovereignty of the Church is in the whole body of the disciples who compose the Church. All power therefore flows not from ministers to people, but from people to ministers."

But when an author claims for the *Didache* the teaching that "Bap-

tism must be administered by pouring on the head in the name of the Trinity" he can hardly be called a safe historical guide.

After this bit of caricature intelligent readers will feel no surprise over the "spots," "infirmities" and "shadows" which the author discovers in Luther after the Diet at Worms. "He appears to have lost the joy and liberty which gave power to his early religious testimony. In the pulpit he did not seem to have that eloquence of the Spirit which had converted cities and kingdoms"—an allusion doubtless to Luther's series of sermons on fanaticism. "At the Castle of Marburg Luther played Pope with Zwingli, divided the Reformation, and created antagonisms which centuries have not buried"—certainly not in the bosom of Dr. Leavitt. "Petulantly he hurled James out of the Canon, and jocosely pronounced Paul napping in Galatians, thus unsettling the authority of Scripture, disturbing the very foundations," &c., &c.

A work abounding in similar passages touching Creeds, Liturgies, Councils, Protestantism, &c., affords great diversion to a tired brain.

E. J. W.

Torchbearers of Christendom. By Robert Remington Doherty. pp. 288.

This clever and quite readable little volume was written for young people and for others who love the Church but do not know much about it. Intended primarily for Epworth Leaguers, it is worthy of Lutheran Leaguers, and is suitable for Sunday School libraries and family reading in general. We notice a few slips such as the term "consubstantiation" for the Lutheran doctrine of Christ's Real Presence, and the mention of Paul Gerhardt as one of the great hymn writers produced by Pietism. The want of historic thoroughness and accuracy is reflected in the statement: "This Church (the Lutheran) has never emphasized the doctrine of the presence of the Holy Spirit." Had the writer said, this church emphasizes the doctrine of the presence of the Holy Spirit, he would have spoken truly. The Lutheran Church claims that the Holy Spirit is present wherever the word is preached and wherever the sacraments are administered.

E. J. W.

The Social Law of Service. By Richard T. Ely, Ph. D., Professor in the University of Wisconsin. pp. 276. Price, 90 cents.

Much that we have said, on another page, in reference to Dr. Lyman Abbott's "Christianity and Social Problems," may with propriety be said of Prof. Ely's "Social Law of Service." The point of view is virtually the same, and hence also their arguments and conclusions. Christ's method of elevating our race is brought into view and emphasized. He shows, moreover, how this method applies in special cases and to the conflicting views and obligations that present themselves in our day. We read here the judgment of a cool-headed Christian Professor in a field of thought that he has cultivated long and well. As

Professor of Political Economy and Director of the School of Economics, Political Science, and History in the University of Wisconsin, his duties have naturally carried him along the kindred line of Social Science, and he has been exceptionally active in his investigations. He also had ample facilities at hand to pursue them. His eight or more published works all bear on this same general subject. In reading this book, therefore, one may feel that he is getting the views not of a scientist but of a close and painstaking and earnest student. The book, indeed, is a growth, the summing up in a sense of the study of years, and hence the mature and well-considered conclusions of the writer. Its wide circulation would do incalculable good.

The World for Christ. By A. J. F. Behrends, D. D. pp. 167. Price, 90 cents.

An excellent contribution to missionary literature. We have here the 1896 series of addresses on missions, delivered at Syracuse University, New York, on the Graves foundation. After an earnest and reverent lecture on the authority to be recognized in conducting missionary work, Dr. Behrends shows, in vivid language, the field to be won, the result to be achieved, the resistance to be overcome, the leaders to be appointed, and the agencies to be employed.

We note as a matter of no little interest and significance also, that these addresses were delivered at a Methodist university by a Congregational minister on a foundation established by an honored member of the Reformed Church. May we not take this as an indication and some encouragement to hope that, even if there shall be no organic union of the churches at an early day on the basis of a common faith, there may be "interdenominational courtesy and fraternity in the prosecution of our common work" (p. 52); and that our Methodist brethren will soon change their policy of spending four or five times as much money on missions in Lutheran Scandinavia as they do in heathen Africa?

Illustrative Notes. A Guide to the Study of the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1897. By Jessie Lyman Hurlbut and Robert Remington Doherty. pp. 376. Price, \$1.25.

The lessons for 1897 will be on the Acts of the Apostles, and here we have original and selected comments, suggestions on methods of teaching, illustrative stories, practical applications, notes on Eastern life, library references, maps, tables, pictures, diagrams, all of which the teacher will find very helpful to him in preparing for his Sunday-school work and in being helpful to his class. If any should wish to have anything in addition to the aids issued by his denominational publishing house, he will likely find in these illustrative notes just what he wants, in compact and systematic shape. It is true that this is from a denominational house (the Methodist), but the discriminating teacher will know where to draw the line in the matter of helps when disputed points in doctrine arise.

Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. By B. B. Loomis, Ph. D., D. D. pp. 71. Price, 25 cents in paper; 40 cents in cloth.

Special attention will be given to the study of the Acts during 1897, especially by the Sunday-schools, and it is a happy coincidence that this little book has appeared just at this time. Any one who wishes to study this book of the New Testament systematically, will find here an excellent help. The suggestions on methods of study and of instruction, though covering but small space, are a valuable part of the book.

Three Old Maids in Hawaii. By Ellen Blackmar Maxwell.

Certainly a taking title. We suppose that readers who see it will be led to wonder who these old maids were, why they went to Hawaii and what they saw and did there; and if they suppose that the narrative of all this will be very interesting they will not be mistaken. It was no ordinary journey that these "old maids" took nor was it an ordinary motive that led them to take it. Indeed they were not ordinary maids but they were in many respects extraordinary. They were gifted with brightness and powers of observation very far above those of the usual traveler, as the reader of this book is sure to conclude, for he finds in it such distinct glimpses into the life of a people about whom so much interest has recently centered that he lays it aside with a genuine feeling of gratitude. A romance is woven into this account of travel which is not unwelcome. It is kept in the background and serves only to give added color and brightness to what is, in every particular, a delightful book.

In His Footsteps. By William E. McLennan.

This is an effort to awaken an interest in the earthly life of Christ. It was prepared, primarily, for the Epworth League of the M. E. Church but it is admirably adapted to the use of all Sunday-school teachers and young people's societies, without regard to denomination. The writer has the power of making very vivid his word pictures and those who read this book carefully will gain great help in their endeavors to make plain and attractive the chronological study of the Lord's journeyings. It is meant to be rather suggestive than exhaustive. Certainly it must prove itself of great value. It is only one of a series, to be called "The Footstep Series," so that those who have the benefit of these outlines will be on the lookout for those that are to come, and they will assuredly find that they will help "to make real the Christ of history."

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The Prophets of the Christian Faith. pp. 241. Price, \$1.25.

After the question, What is a Prophet? is answered by Dr. Lyman Abbott, the ten names that answer to the title of the book are as follows: Isaiah, St. Paul, Clement of Alexandria, St. Augustine, John

Wycliffe, Martin Luther, John Wesley, Jonathan Edwards, Horace Bushnell, Frederick Denison Maurice. The papers on these have been prepared respectively by Drs. Francis Brown, George Matheson, Marcus Dods, Arthur C. McGiffert, W. H. Fremantle, Adolf Harnack, F. W. Farrar, A. M. Fairbairn, T. T. Munger, A. V. G. Allen. The book closes with a chapter by Dr. F. W. Farrar on Can We be Prophets?

The papers are comparatively brief but interesting. They are by authors in full sympathy with their subjects and exceedingly well written. It is doubtful, however, whether the selection of these ten as representative prophets of the Christian faith will meet the approval of one-tenth of a Christian jury well enough qualified to be in the full sense representative. The inclusion of at least two of them reveals the type of theology accepted by the man that made the selection, and this is manifested still more convincingly by the names of more than two of the writers chosen to prepare the papers. We confess that we are not quite "broad" enough to give assent to the choice in every case in either list.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, NEW YORK.

A Harmony of the Life of St. Paul, according to the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles. By Rev. Frank J. Goodwin. pp. 240. Price, \$1.25.

Among the many works published to aid in systematic Bible study this *Harmony of the Life of St. Paul* deserves a prominent place. There is evidence in all its parts of careful and discriminating effort. Even the omissions, in order to avoid too great breaks in the story of the apostle's life, deserve commendation. They consist mainly of the dogmatic and ethical portions of his writings, and the story is thus saved from being lost in his theology. The seventeen sections of the Appendix are marked by a high grade of scholarship and constitute a valuable and exceedingly helpful part of the book. Good maps of St. Paul's missionary journeys and of his voyage to Rome are bound in with the text. Nothing, indeed, seems to have been omitted that will help one in the study of the life of this chief of the apostles.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO., NEW YORK.

Macaulay's Life of Samuel Johnson, together with his Essay on Johnson. Edited with notes and an introduction by Huber Gray Buehler, A. M., English Master at the Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. pp. 110.

This belongs to the series of Longman's English Classics, under the general editorship of George R. Carpenter, A. B., Professor of Rhetoric and English Composition in Columbia College. "This series is designed for use in secondary schools in accordance with the system of study recommended and outlined by the National Committee of Ten, and in direct preparation for the uniform entrance requirements in En-

glish, now adopted by the principal American colleges and universities." Besides Macaulay's Life of Samuel Johnson there are three others prescribed for the 1897 examinations: Shakespeare's Merchant of Venice, Burke's Speech on Conciliation with America, and Scott's Marmion—each with introduction and notes by a special editor. The examination questions are prepared by the general editor.

The introduction and notes by Professor Buehler in this volume are of exceptional merit. The introduction, besides being a model of clearness in style, is well calculated to whet the intellectual appetite for Macaulay's biography and essay. The notes are just what the young student needs by way of help, and possess besides the unusual merit (for mere notes) of being interesting. There is manifest here a full appreciation of what will be most helpful to the student and a rare aptness for meeting those needs—characteristics that mark the born teacher.

THOMAS Y. CROWELL AND COMPANY, 46 EAST 14TH ST., NEW YORK.

Culture and Reform. By Anna Robertson Brown, Ph. D. pp. 32.

In this essay the author strikes the true principle of reform in a sentence on page 19: "The first thing, O child of man, is to put this restless, angered, weary will of thine in harmony with the divine will." She would not have reform work from without inward but from within outward—not mere environment first but character. Culture can then come in as an excellent handmaid of such reform. Her views are put in a striking but somewhat nervous style of expression—short, abrupt, but forceful sentences—giving the seed-thought rather, and letting the reader develop it to its natural conclusion.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT AND COMPANY, PHILADELPHIA.

Myths and Legends of Our Own Land. By Charles M. Skinner.

A feeling of pride will well up in the heart of the American student of folk-lore when he discovers that already his own country is so rich in legend. It has been supposed that only older countries had a folk-lore worth preserving and the writer claims that picturesque and lovely scenery in our own land has been unfavorably compared with that of other lands, not because it was lacking in loveliness but because it did not possess the "glamour that history and fable have flung" around the localities of older countries. Enough legends that are full of all the charm which only legends can have, have been gathered to fill two volumes. The bibliography of American legends is small and these have been gathered from many sources—from newspapers, magazines, histories, records and oral narrative. The search has been a long one and we think this is in great measure a complete collection. The legends have been arranged in the following groups: The Hudson and its Hills; The Isle of Manhattoes and Nearby; On and Near the Delaware; Tales of Puritan Land; Lights and Shadows of the South; The Central States and

Great Lakes; Along the Rocky Range; On the Pacific Slope; As to Buried Riches and Storied Waters, Cliffs and Mountains. As might be expected and hoped some old friends are here, among them, Rip Van Winkle, Mogg Megone, Hiawatha, Agnes Surriage and Evangeline. As we read the legends and discover the locality to which they belong a strong desire is awakened to visit those points now invested with new interest. Surely all who read these legends will feel that the charm of romance belongs to many places which heretofore were devoid of anything more than the practical growth of the world's progress. We have found these books full of delight and predict for them an enviable place in literature. They will find an honored place beside the rapidly accumulating folk-lore of other lands. They are tastefully bound and finely illustrated.

Betty of Wye. By Amy E. Blanchard.

The young heroine of this story was the daughter of a mother whose ideas of life and living were far from being practical and systematic, and of a father who was more of a philosopher than a parent. Living on a Southern plantation, surrounded with influences not calculated to develop in a healthy manner her womanly instincts, this young girl nevertheless grew into a womanly woman and, in her small corner, shone with a brightness that lighted the way for those about her. It is a bright cheery story but with not much depth, and there is in it a certain disregard of the love and reverence due a mother, even though she may not be an ideal one. In laying aside any book the most natural question seems to be, "Wherefore was it written?" and in this case we cannot find the reason unless mere entertainment was the object.

E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

Good Cheer for a Year. Compiled by W. M. L. Jay.

This is the second Year-book which has been compiled from the writings of Phillips Brooks. It contains for each day of the year a scriptural passage, a poetical gem, and a selection from the works of Bishop Brooks. Those who know the original manner of expressing his great thoughts which the wonderful preacher possessed, who remember what lessons of life he taught, how he drew from the word such practical rules for daily living as were a power in his own experience, will look to this compilation for helpful, uplifting thoughts and they will find them in abundance. From the rich storehouse of his writings there have been here gathered such sympathetic, spiritual practical thoughts as must have lasting influence upon all those who begin the days of the year by meditation of them. It cannot be a profitless day whose beginning is illuminated with high and holy thoughts, and the blessings which this Year-book will bring will be manifold. It has been carefully and intelligently compiled and is a most suitable and valuable gift-book.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Stories and Legends from Irving.

There has been, during the past few years, a disposition to use for classes in Literature the Tales of Washington Irving, as they represent the model style of English story-telling. While Irving secured for himself a reputation as a writer of essays, that fame has been overshadowed by his story-telling skill, and so these tales are arranged in attractive and convenient style for students. Ten of Irving's best stories have been gathered into this collection, and they include Dolph Heyliger and Rip Van Winkle. Of the beauty and fascination of these tales we need not speak—they have long since won their way into the hearts of the reading public and they have won a place they will not lose. We consider them as admirably adapted for the purpose for which they have now been published, and are sure they will give to the student in literature a most correct conception of the highest art of story-telling and the best style employed by the story-teller.

L. M. ZIMMERMAN, BALTIMORE.

Sunshine. By the Rev. L. M. Zimmerman, A. M., F. S. Sc.

A great deal of credit is due the individual who in any way makes an effort to brighten the pathway of humanity and that is the aim of this writer. He writes of *Sunshine in Life*; *Sunshine in the Home*; *Sunshine in the Church*; and *Sunshine for Others*. There are many comforting and practical thoughts in these pages and much advice worth heeding. The book is profusely illustrated and these illustrations suggest many helpful lessons.

PERIODICALS.

The January number of *The Century* contains some choice papers. Among them are "Lenbach: the Painter;" "Speech and Speech-Reading for the Deaf;" "Campaigning with Grant;" "Public Spirit in Modern Athens;" "Summer at Christmas-Tide;" "Nelson in the Battle of the Nile;" "An American Composer: Edward A. Macdowell;" and "The Absurdity of War." The illustrations in this number are exceptionally fine and the fiction, with the exception of one story, first class. We do not consider Hamlin Garland's contribution to this number up to the high standard of the *Century* fiction. Dr. Weir Mitchell's serial is developing finely and is attracting an unusual amount of attention.

The Atlantic Monthly for January has a collection of as choice contributions as can be found between the covers of any magazine. "A Century of Social Betterment;" "Emerson, Sixty Years After;" "Dominant Forces in Southern Life;" the third instalment of that delightful series of papers, "Cheerful Yesterdays;" "Mr. James Lane Allen;" "The Poetry of Rudyard Kipling;" and "Men and Letters" are among the conspicuous contributions. The fiction of this number

is of a high order. Paul Leicester Ford's contribution to that department possesses very unusual merit.

St. Nicholas for January is a splendid New Year number, and the youth who has the promise of this magazine for the coming year can expect much of information, entertainment and amusement from it. "Danny and the Major" is a story that is captivating. "Hop Wing and the Missing Treasure;" "Master Skylark;" "June's Garden;" "Bertholde;" "A Tender-Hearted Monster;" "The True Story of Marco Polo;" "The Last Three Soldiers;" and "St. Nicholas Day in Holland" are the leading features of the January number but there are plenty of other attractions in the way of papers, letters, puzzles and illustrations.

The managers of the *Youth's Companion* are exceptionally fertile in means for improving their paper. During the last year they seemed to have reached their limit, but now they come with a new and attractive feature for 1897. There will be six groups of short stories dealing with personal experiences, unusual incidents, and humorous and pathetic events in professional life. The groups have been contributed (we learn from the prospectus) by ministers, doctors, lawyers, teachers, college professors and journalists. Each profession offers its own peculiar opportunity for noting varying conditions by which character is developed, and right or wrong exemplified. The stories are exceptionally fresh in plot and incident, and will be read with eager interest. Along with this new feature the other attractions of the *Companion* will be as marked as heretofore.

Table Talk for December also gives evidence of special preparation this month. The first contribution is "The Road to Christmas;" "A Hard-Times Diet;" "Mexican Pottery;" "The New Bill of Fare;" "Entertainments;" "When we make Merry at Christmas;" "A Blue-Grass Dining;" "E'er the Dawn of Another Year;" and "What the Housekeeper Does"—all are acceptable but especial care has been given to the recipes and menus, and these the housekeeper will particularly welcome.